

A
R E P L Y
T O
Mr. *Samuel Clifford*:
W H E R E I N

His Scurrilous and Abusive Reflections, (under pretence of vindicating the late Reverend Mr. Baxter,) are shewed to be groundless.

And the old Protestant Doctrine, of *Justification by Christ's Righteousness and Faith only*, is explained and vindicated.

By *John England* Minister of the Gospel at *Sherborne* in *Dorsetshire*.

PRO. 18. 17. *He that is first in his own cause seemeth just, but his Neighbour cometh and searcheth him.*

L O N D O N,

Printed by *J. Hepsinstall*, for the Author, and is to be sold by *Thos. Parkhurst* at the *Bible and Three Crowns* in *Chancery* in *London*, and *John Miller*, Bookseller in *Sherborne*. 1702.

READER

The first of these is the fact that the world is a very different place from what it was a few years ago. The progress of science and the discovery of new lands have opened up a new world of knowledge and power. The second is the fact that the world is a very different place from what it was a few years ago. The progress of science and the discovery of new lands have opened up a new world of knowledge and power. The third is the fact that the world is a very different place from what it was a few years ago. The progress of science and the discovery of new lands have opened up a new world of knowledge and power.



TO THE
READER

T Here is no Person, who is not a stranger in our Israel, but must needs hear of those feuds and contentions, that have been of late years, especially at London, about Justification, and the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness. The contending Brethren have managed the matter with so great Heat, and such Personal Reflections to the wounding each other in their Reputations; that by-standers have been much offended, fearing that Religion would suffer by it: and therefore sometimes with an Ardent wish have called to Remembrance that of the Psalmist, Psal. 133. 1. Behold how good and pleasant it is, for Brethren to dwell together in unity; whilst at other times with an awful fear they could not but reflect on that of the Apostle, Gal. 5. 16. But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another.

It is sad to consider that any should Disturb the Peace of the Church by opposing the Doctrine of the Assembly's Catechism, so well established on Scripture Foundations. It is Reported of Archbishop Usher, that he had such a value for this Book, and esteemed it so well composed, that he could have allowed the Composers of it a whole Age for that work alone. And till we are otherwise convinced in Judgment, we fear not to conclude; that we are in Possession of the best form of sound words, next to the Bible, that is extant in the world.

To the Reader.

It was in defence of this excellent Catechism that I published my Disputation, wherein I took liberty to mention the late Reverend Mr. Baxter, as swerving from the Doctrine therein contained, particularly in his denying the Federal Headship of Adam and Christ; both which are expressly maintained, or at least supposed, as a necessary support to some other Doctrines in that Book, the Imputation of Adam's Sin and Christ's Righteousness.

I had never mentioned that Worthy Person by way of opposition, (whose Name I honour, whose Works I value, whose Memory to me (as I said formerly) is dear and Precious,) had it not been for very Weighty considerations.

I observed our form of sound words began to be Questioned in some Material parts of it, by Persons that would not have ventured to have done it, had they not had Great Mr. B. to flee to for Defence. And if we let go this excellent form, I know not when we shall have a better.

I perceived that the Peace of the Church was disturbed, as formerly at London, so of late in the Country, by departing from the Faith, held forth in our Catechism. And great are the mischiefs of strife and discord: we ought to value the Peace of the Church.

I observed we are crumbling and dividing into Parties; Mr. B. is made the Head of a Party. The name Baxterian is already coined, and goes current among some; not to mention the opposite name, Antinomian, which in my observation has been by that Party put on some, who abhor Antinomianism, both Name and Thing.

In short, I found all those that own Christ to be a Legal Representative, confused by Mr. B. in his Universal Redemption, p. 68. as overthrowing the

To the Reader

the Substance of the Gospel. And I found in particular Dr. Owen (and others of his opinion about Justification,) censured by him (at least implicitly) as Subverters of the Gospel. See his Scripture Gospel Defended, p. 109. So that I was jealous that in short time, (if Baxterianism Prevail,) all those that own the Assembly's Catechism, and plead for the Doctrine of our first Reformers, who maintained the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness it self, in opposition to the Papists, would be esteemed Antinomians, if not downright Subverters of the Gospel. Mr. B. himself spares neither. Luther is censured as somewhat favouring of Antinomian Principles, Treat. of Justif. right. p. 22. And little less is suggested Concerning the Reverend Westminster Assembly, p. 26.

On these and such like considerations I was induced to oppose the Reverend Mr. B. by Name. Not from any disrespect to him, for I highly value his Memory and Works, as I have said already: but with a Design to Prevent the growth of those Differences, that are among us, both in the City and Country; by shewing that those, who plead for the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness in Justification, can defend that Doctrine, without running into Antinomianism, the Error that is Commonly charged on them.

In my Disputation I do not call Names; I have always look'd on that, as a shrewd sign of a Bad cause: I only consider Doctrine and Argument; at least I profess'dly do nothing else; tho my Antagonist has look'd in matters of Fact, as he calls them; which might all be spared, and yet the Disputation remain for Substance the same thing.

I shew myself of no Party; and therefore have oppos'd Mr. Mather by Name, as well as Mr. Baxter. The way I take in defending our Doctrine does no way

countenance Antinomian Errors. As it does maintain the Grace of the Gospel, and the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness in Justification, so it does establish Gospel Conditions. My design in it was Truth and Peace; not to Foment and continue differences, but to Heal our Breaches; to shew that we need not a new Catechism; and that the Doctrine, we are already in Possession of, is sufficient to Answer the great Ends of Religion, without the bringing in of new Doctrine, to the unavoidable disturbance of the Churches quiet.

I am so far from being Humbled for what I have done, to which my good Brother, Mr. Robinson does call me, that I must profess, that I acted (as I thought) from a Pious Zeal; and supposed I did nothing but what was Pleasing to God: and I am still of the same opinion for ought hitherto I have seen to convince me.

Mr. Sa. Clifford indeed is very angry, and has Endeavour'd as much as Possible to blast my Reputation, and to render me in Matters of this Nature, Unserviceable for the future; by telling the world, that I am a Man of Deeper confidence than Judgment, a careless Reader, that don't understand Mr. B's. Writings, that I have abused him and the world too, with much more of this Nature, wherewith his little Book is filled. But against all this I was forewarn'd in my other Preface, having told the world there, that 'tis the Lot of Ministers as well as others to go through good report and bad report, 2 Cor. 6. 8.

It is not what Mr. Cl. does say, but what he can Prove. I must say this, that he has not attempted so much as to Answer one of my Arguments, nor to shew me wherein my Inferences are not well grounded, in that Scheme I deduce from Mr. B's. Proposition, that

that Christ was no Legal Representative. He tells the world, that I misrepresent and abuse Mr. B. I tell him again that I am able to prove what I charge on Mr. B. in Point of Doctrine, from that single Proposition of his, and the other Passage I refer to, if I had nothing else in his other Writings.

It was not my design in that Disputation to examine all Mr. B's Books, but only one single Proposition, which he lays down in his Book of Redemption, with one other Passage in the same Book, Relating to the Doctrine of Original Sin. And therefore I quoted no other Particular places, besides those two. I do, I confess, here and there refer in the General to some other of Mr. B's Writings, and because I did not produce the Place, (which was not my design, tho I was ready on any just call,) this Author pretends I cannot do it, and quotes other places, in his apprehension of a contrary Nature, and then cries out, he has wronged Mr. B. and abused Mr. B. so Disingenuously does he deal with me.

This Author is no stranger to me, but of my Acquaintance, who has wrote to me on other occasions; and had he chang'd a line with me now, to have known what I had to say for my self before he had thus Exposed me in Publick; perhaps I might have given him Satisfaction, and so have saved him this trouble. But it may be this would not Answer his End: I have engaged against a new Party springing up among us; and therefore I shall Forfeit my Reputation, Right or Wrong; yea tho' he Venture his own for it.

It is with me a small thing (as saith the Apostle) to be Judged of Man's Judgment, 1 Cor. 4. 3. And whilst I am able to approve my Heart and Actions unto God, I shall not much regard the Reproaches of others.

TO the Reader.

However seeing a good Name is a valuable blessing, rather to be chosen, in the Judgment of Solomon, than great Riches, Pro. 22. 1. and should be prized by Ministers for their Work sake, I shall therefore Endeavour to wipe off the dirt, which this Author has cast on me. And in so doing I must of necessity rake in the Ashes of the Reverend Mr. B. a work, that I confess is unpleasing to me, from that great respect I bear to his Memory.

I shall endeavour in the following Pages to give the Reader a true account of Mr. B's Judgment, in the present matters under Debate. And whether I have abused Mr. B. or rather, whether this Author has abused me, shall be left to the Judgment of the candid Reader.

T H E

(1)

A
R E P L Y
T O

Mr. Sam. Clifford, &c.

CHARGE 1st. *Concerning Mr. B's. new Scheme of Divinity.*

§. I. **T**HE first thing that Mr. Sa. Cl. lays to my charge is my ascribing to Mr. B. a *new Scheme of Divinity, somewhat differing from the Assembly's Catechism, and 39 Articles of the Church of England.* This Charge we have, p. 1, 2.

R E P L Y.

This Charge I own. I confess that I do in my *Disputation* ascribe to Mr. B. a *new Scheme of Divinity*, which has obtained of late years the name of *Baxterianism*. And because this *Author* is offended with me for so doing, pretending, p. 6. that I have not told him, what this *New Scheme of Divinity* is, nor wherein it differs from the *Assembly's Confession*, &c.

B

I shall

I shall therefore so far comply with him, as to repeat this *new Scheme*; tho' had he not been a *Careless* reader, he might have saved me this trouble, by finding it already set down in my *Disputation*, p. 383, 405, 415, &c.

Know, *Reader*, that the Question I proposed to be debated was this, *Whether Adam and Christ were two Federal Heads and Legal Representatives?* This I held in the *Affirmative*, and withall suggested that Mr. B. *Denies* both. Which being Premised I added this, that *I take these two Points to be the Foundation of all Baxterianism, or that new Scheme of Divinity that Mr. B. has presented the world with, as differing from the Assembly's Confession and Catechism, and the 39 Articles of the Church of England. Which Scheme stands thus in two Branches.*

First, if *Adam* was not a *Federal Head* or *Legal Representative*, then I see no solid Foundation for the *Imputation* of *Adam's* sin, as I shew in my *Disputation*, p. 406, &c.

And if *Adam's* sin be not *Imputed*, then this undermines the whole Doctrine of *Original Sin*, as I also shew, p. 404, &c. And Mr. B. himself will own the *Consequence* on this supposition, that *Adam's* sin is not *Imputed*; as we learn from his *Disputation of Original Sin*, p. 224, &c. And thus at once we strike out a good part of our *Catechism*, particularly that clause at Q. 16. (*The Covenant being made with Adam not only for himself but for all his Posterity.*) And that clause at Q. 18. (*The sinfulness of that Estate whereinto man fell consists in the guilt of Adam's first Sin, &c.*)

Know, *Reader*, that I do not say that Mr. B. does expressly deny all this; but some of it he expressly rejects, and the rest by *Consequence*. He expressly rejects *Adam's* being a *Federal Head*, (in the sense that our Divines do generally understand it,) and so differs from the *Assembly's Catechism* at Question 16. And tho' he Protesteth to own the *Imputation* of *Adam's* sin, and the corruption of our Nature, yet undermining the foundation of it, *Adam's federal relation*, I therefore charge

charge the denial of this on him only by consequence.

This is all that I spake in my *Disputation* to the first Branch of this new Scheme, as it respects Adam.

The other Branch is this; If Christ was not a Legal Representative, then hence it will follow,

1. That Christ's sufferings for man's sin were not the Idem, the same that the Law threatened us, but only somewhat Equivalent.

2. Then also our sins were not imputed unto Christ; and consequently God punished an Innocent person, one that was both Personally and Judicially so.

3. Then the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness in Justification will be denied; For this Doctrine is Founded on the other, and 'tis observable that those who deny one do usually also deny the other. And

4. If imputed Righteousness be rejected then we shall establish our own Righteousness in Justification; For which the Jews were blamed of old, Rom. 9. 32. and 10. 3.

This Scheme you have in the several Particulars, (in the same order as here mentioned,) in my *Disputation*, p. 415, &c. And yet this Author calls on me for my Scheme. What a Trifling sort of Person does he shew himself?

He tells us, p. 2. That he has read over the 39 Articles more than once; and upon the strictest observation that he can make, he cannot espy one place in them that is contrary to that which I call Baxterianism, and therefore untill I turn him to the Article, he shall conclude that I have abused, Mr. B. and the world, &c.

To help this Author's observation, (who, if we will take his own word, is a strict observer of what he reads,) I shall shew in some Instances that there is a difference between the 39 Articles and the above Scheme.

Concerning the Federal Headship of Adam, and the Imputation of his sin grounded thereon, (if so be we admit of the best Expositors that are now extant, who can't be Supposed to be Byassed in their Judgment as to this Particular,) the 39 Articles are very express.

The Ninth Article stands thus. *Original Sin standeth not in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do mainly talk, but it is the fault and corruption of the Nature of every Man, that naturally is Engendred of the off-spring of Adam, &c.*

And if we would know, how it came to be *our fault* as well as *Adam's*, the right Reverend Bishop Burnet in his late *Exposition* of the 39 Articles will inform us; where he does freely acknowledge in his exposition of this ninth Article, (whatever his Lordship's own opinion is,) that the first Compilers of the 39 Articles grounded the Imputation of Adam's sin on his Federal Headship. For his Lordship speaking of the several Opinions that are going in the World about the Derivation of Adam's sin unto his Posterity, at length comes to that which he takes to be the Judgment of the first Compilers of the 39 Articles, which he delivers in these words.

' There is a further step made by all the disciples of S. Austin, who believe that a Covenant was made with all mankind in Adam, as their first parent: that he was a person constituted by God to Represent them all; and that the Covenant was made with him, so that if he had obeyed, all his posterity should have been happy, through his obedience; but by his disobedience they were all to be esteemed to have sinned in him, his act being imputed and transferred to them all, &c. And this explication (as saith his Lordship, p. 114.) does certainly quadrate more entirely to the words of the Article, as it is known that this was the Tenet of those, who prepared the Articles, it having been the generally received opinion from S. Austin's days downward.

Now if this was the Doctrine of the first Compilers of the 39 Articles, as his Lordship tells us it was their known Tenet, then here is one place wherein they differ from the above Scheme.

Mr. Rogers also in his *Exposition* of the 39 Articles, (which has been long extant,) is very express touching the Imputation of Adam's sin. For in explaining that clause, (*viz. Original sin is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, &c.*) he hath these words. ' Original

‘ ginal sin is not the Imitation of *Adam* his disobedience; for the Scripture speaketh no such thing, &c.
 ‘ But it is partly the *Imputation* of *Adam*’s disobedience
 ‘ unto us, and partly the fault and corruption of man’s
 ‘ nature, as the Churches also do acknowledge, &c.

And with reference to the other branch concerning *Justification* by *Christ*’s Righteousness, and the exclusion of our own good works from having a hand in this business, or being copartners with our faith, the Church of England, in her *Articles* and *Homilies*, is very express.

The 11th. Article stands thus. *We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings: wherefore that we are justified by faith only is most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort, &c.*

I suppose this Author cannot but see (now ’tis set before him) a manifest difference between this Article and the last inference in the above Scheme. One excludes works from Justification, the other does establish them. According to the Doctrine of the Church of England, good works do follow after Justification, as we learn from Article 12th. according to the Doctrine of the above Scheme, good works do precede our Justification, as that which constitutes our persons righteous, Christ having purchased this grace for us.

We have also the sense of the Church of England plainly set down as to this particular in the book of *Homilies*, particularly in the *Sermon of Salvation*, p. 13. where are these words, *Because all men being sinners and offenders against God, and breakers of his Law and commandments, therefore can no man by his own acts, words and deeds (be they never so good) be justified and made righteous before God: but every man of necessity is constrained to seek for another righteousness, &c.*

Here the Imputation of Christ’s righteousness is established, and good works are excluded from the office of justifying. And the same Doctrine we find again, p. 14; 15. *That faith (which justifieth) doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread, and the fear of God, to be joyed with faith in every man that is justified; but it shutteth them out from the office of Justifying. so that al-*

though they be all present together in him that is justified yet they justify not all together, &c.

Consequently we are justified by *faith only*, and this also the *Homilies* teach, for thus it follows, p. 16. *faith only justifieth is the Doctrine of the old Doctors, of whom I will specially rehearse three, Hilary, Basil, and Ambrose. S. Hilary saith these words plainly in the 9th. Canon upon Matthew, faith only justifieth. And St. Basil a Greek Author writeth thus, this is a perfect and whole rejoicing in God, when a man advanceth not himself for his own righteousness, but acknowledgeth himself to lack true justice and righteousness, and to be justified by the only faith in Christ, &c. And St. Ambrose, a Latin Author saith these words, this is the ordinance of God, that they which believe in Christ should be saved without works, by faith only, freely receiving the Remission of their sins. These and other like sentences, that we be justified by faith only, freely and without works, we do read oft-times in the best and Ancientest writers. As besides Hilary, Basil, and S. Ambrose before rehearsed, we read the same in Origen, S. Chrysostome, S. Cyprian, S. Augustine, Prosper, Oecumenius, Proclus, Bernardus, Anselm, and many other Authors, Greek and Latin.*

Thus according to the Doctrine of the Church of England, we are not justified by *our own works*, (be they never so good,) but by the *righteousness of another*, (namely Christ's :) and therefore by *faith only* in opposition unto *Gospel works*; for though *Gospel works*, repentance, fear, love, and obedience do always accompany justifying faith, as the *fruits* of it: yet according to the Doctrine of the Church of England, they are not joined with it in the office of justifying. So that the Doctrine of the Church of England in her *Articles* and *Homilies* does plainly oppose the Doctrine contained in the above Scheme.

And with reference to the *Assembly's Catechism* we have already shewn that this differs from the above Scheme in the first branch of it, relating to *Adam*. And with reference to the last branch, respecting *Christ* and his *righteousness*, we must strike out that clause in the
shorter

shorter Catechism at Q. 33, (only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us,) and that clause in the larger Catechism at Q. 70. (not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but only for the perfect obedience and full Satisfaction of Christ, by God imputed to them, and received by faith alone,) And that clause in their Confession of faith, chap. 11. §. 1. (not by imputing faith it self, the act of believing, or any other evangelical righteousness to them as their righteousness, but by imputing the obedience and Satisfaction of Christ, &c.) I say, we must strike out all this, if we admit of the above Scheme, and this according to the two last inferences drawn from Mr. B's professed principle, that Christ was no Legal Representative.

Thus having shewn this *Author* some difference between the *above Scheme* and the Doctrine contained in the 39 Articles and the Assembly's Confession and Catechism, when he with his strictest observation and reading could not espy one place, contrary to that which I call *Baxterianism*; I hope for the future, that he will forbear telling the world, that I have abused Mr. B. and the world, in saying Mr. B. has presented the world with a new Scheme of Divinity, somewhat differing from the Assembly's Catechism and 39 Articles, &c.

I am not the first that hath ascribed to Mr. B. a new Scheme of Divinity. Mr. John Troughton in his *Lutherus Redivivus* doth the same. For, part first, chap. 1. Disputing expressly against Mr. Baxter, Mr. Hotchkis, and Mr. Truman, he sums up their Doctrine in several propositions; and gives us a Scheme by way of Thesis and Antithesis both of their and of the old Protestant Doctrine, that so the difference may more clearly appear. This Scheme we have, p. 9, &c. in these words.

' Thesis 1. The Protestants have hitherto taught, that what Christ did and suffered for sinners, he did as a Common Person, as a Head and Representative of the Elect and a surety for them.

' Antithesis. But they say, Christ was not a proper Head, Representative or surety, but that he did all
B 4 merely

‘ merely as a *Mediator*, i. e. as one endeavouring to
 ‘ compose the difference betwixt God and sinners.

‘ *Thesis 2.* That Christ as their head and *surety* fulfilled the *Law of Works* in their stead.

‘ *Antithesis.* That Christ *undertook* not to fulfil the
 ‘ *Law of Works*, which man had broken, nor to satisfy
 ‘ it, but that he fulfilled the *peculiar Law of a Mediator*,
 ‘ i. e. so much obedience and suffering as should please
 ‘ the Father to lay upon him.

‘ *Thesis 3.* That Christ by *bearing the Curse* of the
 ‘ *Law*, delivered man from the curse; and by *obeying*
 ‘ *the precepts* purchased for him life, which the law promised;
 ‘ and by the *Supereminence* of his obedience, additions of
 ‘ blessedness to that life.

‘ *Antithesis.* That Christ by his obedience and suffering did
 ‘ neither *Satisfie the Law*, nor *purchase* what the law had
 ‘ promised; but only gave to God a *valuable consideration* or
 ‘ *recompence*, that he might justly *wave* or not execute the
 ‘ *law of works*, but give man a new and milder law of
 ‘ grace, or terms of life, according as the Father and Son
 ‘ should agree.

‘ *Th. 4.* That this *Righteousness of Christ* whereby
 ‘ he fulfilled the law is *imputed* to believers for their
 ‘ *Justification*, i. e. for that righteousness God grants them
 ‘ pardon of sin, and a firm gift or grant of eternal life.

‘ *Antith.* That therefore *Christ's righteousness* or
 ‘ *obedience* cannot be *imputed* to men, for which they
 ‘ should be accepted and justified, not being the obedience
 ‘ due to the *Law* given to *them*, but to his own peculiar
 ‘ law of a *Mediator*; but Christ's obedience did purchase
 ‘ that God should appoint men new and mild conditions of
 ‘ life, instead of sinless obedience, and dearth for the failure
 ‘ of it.

‘ *Th. 5.* This *Righteousness of Christ* is that alone,
 ‘ which we must *oppose* to the wrath of God, by which
 ‘ we must *stand* before him in judgment, for which alone
 ‘ Heaven is *given* us, and all things necessary to bring us
 ‘ thither.

Antith.

Antith. That the *righteousness* of Christ hath only purchased the removing of the *law of works*, from being a Covenant of life, by which we must stand or fall: but that our *right* to life and the favour of God, peace of Conscience and hope of Heaven do depend upon our *obedience to the Gospel*, which Christ hath purchased, should be accepted for our *righteousness*, by which we must be judged.

Th. 6. That by this *righteousness* Imputed believers are perfectly justified, i.e. freed from all the curse of the law, and certainly entitled to eternal life.

Antith. That our Justification or right to life dependeth wholly on our *obedience*, as the condition to which it is promised; and therefore it puts us into a condition or state of life *Imperfect*, and subject to change, as obedience it self is, that we are not perfectly justified till obedience be perfected.

Th. 7. That by their *obedience* believers serve God, and are fitted for Heaven, and their *afflictions* are *Paternal corrections* to quicken them and to purge them, but not inflicted as effects of the *Curse*.

Antith. That believers by their *obedience* obtain, continue and perfect their *right* to Heaven; and that their *afflictions* are fruits of the *curse* of the law of works, Christ having purchased only that it should not damn us, but left it to the Father to punish us for sins in this life, as he shall think fit.

Th. 8. We are made partakers of Christ's righteousness and the benefits of it (*by faith*;) and that faith is a *trusting* in the promise of life, for the sake of Christ's righteousness.

Antith. That *faith* in its whole latitude is believing and obeying the *Gospel*, that by this we are made partakers of the benefits of Christ, he having only purchased this grant or law, that they which obey him, should be saved, not that his *obedience* should save them.

Th. 9. That *Justification* is the Acceptance of a sinner with God as *righteous*, through the *righteousness* of

of Jesus Christ, *imputed* to him, whereby he hath a full right to eternal life.

Antith. Justification is nothing else but the pardon of sin, i. e. the not exacting the punishment due by the law of works, and an acceptance of man so far and so long, as he performeth the new condition of sincere obedience.

Thus far Mr. Troughton. See more to the same purpose at Chap. 7. p. 89. So then I am not the first, nor singular in ascribing to Mr. B. a new Scheme of Divinity, somewhat differing from the old Protestant Doctrine.

Now that Scheme, which I ascribed to him, I did not deduce from Mr. B's. writings in the general, but from that book I examined in particular, viz. his book of *universal Redemption*. where he denies Christ to be a *Legal Representative*, p. 67. And gives occasion to believe, p. 473. that he undermines the Doctrine of *Imputed sin*.

Now know, Reader, that this book of Mr. B's. was put forth *since his death*. It was composed about the fortieth year of his age, as Mr. Read (to whose care the Publication was committed,) gives us an account, in his *Epistle* to the Reader. Now that Mr. B. should keep this book so many years by him, and reserve its publication till he was dead I would not pretend to guess at the reason, had not he himself declared it, in his *Confession of faith*, p. 2. in these words, *I have not only since suppressed that book* (namely his Aphorisms of Justification) *which did offend them* (viz. his Brethren,) *but also laid by those papers of Universal Redemption, which I had written, lest I should be farther offensive.* I make no remark on this, that which I say is only this, that the book came forth *after he was dead*. And therefore for this Author to reflect on me, for answering Mr. B. when he was dead, is very *Disingenuous*.

As to what he saith of a long beard, 'tis so trifling, it deserves contempt. 'Tis not a great beard, but a good argument that is of use in this business. Truth ought to be received from what quarter so ever it comes.

What

What has this *Author* to except against it, Suppose I should recur to *Elihu's* apology, *Job* 32. 7, 8. It was *Levi's* commendation, that in *God's* cause he knew not his *Father*, *Deut.* 33. 9.

Besides, I think I had many *grave* *beards* to avouch my Doctrine. I foresaw the objection, and therefore studiously confirmed my Doctrine by the Suffrage and testimony of some of the gravest and ablest *Divines* of this last age. Such as *Archbishop Usher*, *Bishop Downe*, *Bishop Davenant*, *Bishop Reynolds*, *Bishop Hopkins*, *Dr. Ward*, *Dr. Grew*, *Dr. Preston*, *Dr. Bates*, *Dr. Owen*, *Dr. Manton*, *Dr. Thomas Goodwin*, *Mr. Hildersham*, *Mr. Lawson*, *Mr. Clarkson*, *Mr. Charnock*, and several others, besides foreign *Divines*, the *Synod of Charenton*, the famous *Turretin*, &c. also publick *Annotations*, the *Dutch*, the *Assembly's*, and the *Continuators* of *Mr. Pools* Notes, who all speak the same thing that I do, wherein I differ from *Mr. B.* And among all these I suppose we may find some *grown beards*, to make use of this *Author's* phrase. And let me add, tho one *Mr. B.* be allowed to weigh down, for learning and piety, any single person of the above named; yet all put together, I think, in the judgment of *unprejudiced* persons may turn the scale. And I doubt not but these Reverend and Learned *Divines* knew how to establish the Imputation of *Adam's* sin and *Christ's* righteousness on solid foundations, tho *Mr. Robinson* is pleased to tell us in his Epistle recommendatory, that they were never so well cleared, nor so solidly established as by *Mr. B.* what a solid foundation *Mr. B.* has laid for the support of these *Doctrines* has been shewn already in some measure, and may farther be discovered in the following *Sections*, to which it is almost time to hasten.

CHARGE

CHARGE II. *Concerning the Imputation of Adam's Sin, and his Federal Headship.*

§. II. **T**HE next thing that this *Author* lays to my charge is that I assert, that Mr. B. denies the *Imputation of Adam's sin, and does herein agree with the Salmurian Professors.* This charge we have, p. 6, 8.

R E P L Y.

This charge consists of two *Branches.* I shall speak distinctly to both of them.

First this *Author* does lay to my charge, that I assert, that Mr. B. denies the *Imputation of Adam's sin*, for which he quotes my *Disputation*, p. 417. The *Salmurian Professors* denying Adam to be a *Legal Representative* deny also the *Imputation of Adam's sin*, and so does Mr. B. in his book of *Redemption*, p. 473.

In answer to this I must crave leave to explain myself. A person may be said to deny a thing two ways; *in terminis*, and expressly, or by consequence and in effect. Now 'twas not my meaning that Mr. B. does deny the *Imputation of Adam's sin* *Professedly* and in terms, but only by consequence and in effect.

That 'twas not my meaning that Mr. B. does deny the *Imputation of Adam's sin* in *express* terms is very apparent from many *circumstances*, which, (had not this *Author* been a *Careless Reader*,) he might easily have perceived. (1.) The place, that I refer to, is sufficient evidence, where it is denied only by consequence. (2.) Mr. B's. other writings, where the *Imputation of Adam's sin* is *Professedly* owned by him. (3.) I myself in my *Disputation* do plainly *confess* it. For having opposed the *Salmurian Professors*, who expressly deny the *Imputation of Adam's sin*, I proceed to consider Mr. B's *Doctrine*, who does *professedly* own the thing, but does establish it on such a bottom, as (in my apprehension) undermines the whole *Doctrine*, as I have shewn more
at

at large in my *Disputation*, p. 406, &c. concluding what I say on this head after this manner; *If therefore the Doctrine of the Imputation of Adam's sin be esteemed a useful and necessary point, I conceive it requires a larger foundation to be built on, than our Interest in Adam as a Natural head*, p. 407. In which words any, but this Author, mighty easily have perceived, that I had a manifest respect to Mr. B's. Doctrine, tho I did not name him in that place.

Thus far then I deny the charge. My meaning was not, neither do I assert, that Mr. B. does *professedly* deny the *Imputation of Adam's sin*.

But that he denies this Doctrine in effect I have made appear in my *disputation*, in the forequoted pages; and shall now manifest from that place I refer to, in his *book of Redemption*; tho this Author has confidence enough to tell the world, p. 8. that Mr. B. in that place does *expressly* assert this Doctrine, but has not the honesty to quote his words, only part of them, left by quoting the full sentence it would have appeared at first view to the Reader, that there was something in what I said, and so 'twould have spoiled the after merriment made thereupon about Mr. B's. denying the Bible, and that witty reflection in the close of all, as tho my quotations were only calculated for the meridian of *Carole's Readers*, such as myself and none besides.

That the world may see, there was no grounded for all this *Triumph*, I shall quote the full period I referred to, and thence make it appear that Mr. B. in effect does deny the *Imputation of Adam's sin*. His words are these; *It seems most probable that it was not only Adam's first sin that is imputable to his posterity, but that we are all still guilty of all our Parents sin to this day, &c.* I will not stand now to the proof of this, any further than to tell you, that the same solid arguments, which prove the *Imputableness of Adam's sin*; seem to me to prove this; and by denying this we overthrow the grounds of the Doctrine of the said *Imputation*. Univ. Red. p. 473, 474.

What more evident from these words than this, that Mr. B. does establish the *Imputation of Adam's sin* on no other

other grounds but what are sufficient to establish the Imputation of our Immediate Parents sins. Now, if it appear that there is no *solid foundation* for the Imputation of all our *Immediate Parents* sins, then hence it will follow, that there is likewise no *solid foundation*, (according to Mr. B.) for the imputation of *Adam's sin*; because by Mr. B. they are both established on the *same foundation*. But it appears that there is no sufficient and *solid foundation* for the Imputation of all our *Immediate Parents* sins; for the Scripture saith in express terms, *the son shall not bear the iniquity of the Father*, Eze. 18. 20. and therefore we use not to *confess* in our Prayers the particular sins of our *Immediate Parents*, as we do the *first sin of Adam*. And consequently it remains according to this Doctrine, that there is no *solid foundation* left for the Imputation of *Adam's sin*. In effect it is denied, tho in words 'tis maintained: and this will justify what I said in my *Disputation*.

And I farther add *ex abundanti* that if I reprint this Disputation, I will either add these words (in effect) to that clause, (and so does Mr. B. in his book of *Redemption*.) or else leave the sentence out, seeing other persons as well as this Author may mistake my meaning. For tho Mr. B. does in effect deny the Imputation of *Adam's sin*, undermining (as I conceive) the foundations of it: yet he does *professedly* own the Doctrine, and disputes for it, as appears by his other writings, particularly his *Disputations about Original sin*, where he opposeth the Learned *Placeus* by name, on this point. And this leads to the next branch of the Charge.

Secondly this Author does lay to my charge, that I affirm that Mr. B. is of the same opinion with the *Sal-murian Professors*, in this point, the Imputation of *Adam's sin*.

To which I reply, it is a *gross abuse*, and herein this Author is manifestly guilty of that fault he pretends to correct, namely of *misrepresenting* other mens writings.

This part of the charge is managed by him, p. 8. in these words; *It's well known, that what our Author pretends Mr. B. denies, is what he hath ex Professo disputed for,*

for, and published his *Disputations* to the world, both in his *Methodus Theologicæ*, and in his two *Disputations* of *Original sin*. Nay more, he doth appose himself to *Placcus* by name, who was that very *Salmurian* Professor, with whom he would persuade us, that *Mr. B.* does herein agree, &c. How basely therefore does he insinuate as if *Mr. B.* did concur with *Placcus* in a point, upon which he does de industria, and by name dispute against him!

Not to take notice of this Author's civil language, wherewith he abounds, I shall only consider the justness of the cause, and examine a little, whether there was given sufficient ground for this unhandsome reflection.

Therefore know, Reader, that this Author, either for want of judgment or observation, does mistake my meaning. That which I speak of *Mr. B.*'s agreement with the *Salmurian* Professors is at the beginning of my *disputation*, p. 383. Having laid down the Q. *Whether Adam and Christ were two Federal Heads and Legal Representatives?* I immediately proceed to shew by whom these Doctrines were denyed, in these words. *The Salmurian Professors dispute against the former, as appears by their disputing against the Imputation of Adam's sin; and Mr. B. in his book of Redemption disputes against the latter, and is also of the same opinion with the Salmurian Professors in the former point, as appears by what he saith, p. 473. In which last sentence by the (former point,) as is plain to any that will consider my words, is meant the federal headship of Adam, not the Imputation of Adam's sin. And in that respect I still assert there is an agreement: for both of them reject this. And this I shall prove as to that part, which is now in debate, concerning Mr. B.*

That *Mr. B.* denies *Adam* to be a *Federal Head*, and rejects this from being the ground of the *Imputation* of *Adam's sin*, is plain from his writings.

In his two *Disput. of Orig. sin*, p. 158. he hath these words. 'As we are members of the great Commonwealth of the world, whereof God is the Sovereign, so we are guilty by reason of the sin, which mankind in our first Parents committed in the beginning. For
: God

• God dealt with *Adam* in his first laws, not only as an
 • Individual person, but also as *whole mankind*, he and
 • his wife being then the *whole world*. And so as we
 • are first guilty of death, because of our *natural interest*
 • in *Adam's sin*, as being his progeny, so next we are al-
 • so guilty by reason of this *civil or reputative interest*
 • as being members of the *sinful world*, or of *sinful man-*
 • *kind*: which latter yet supposeth the former, as its
 • ground, and doth not arise from any *Covenant* or will
 • of God to impute that to us, which we were never
 • guilty of by any *natural interest* of our own.

P. 164. He speaks thus; 'It seems to me, that the
 • sins of *nearer parents* may do much to the *corrupting*
 • of our *natures*, as well as the *sin of Adam*; and to in-
 • crease the *pravity* that from his *only sin* would have
 • been upon them. Proved, 1. there is the same reason
 • why the sins of *Immediate parents* should deprave
 • the nature of *posterity*, as there is that *Adam's sin*
 • should do it. And p. 168. There is no reason that I
 • know of that can be given, why a more corrupt
 • parent should not beget a child more corrupt, and de-
 • liver him the *sinful improvement* of his *pravity*, as
 • well as that all *sinful depraved parents* should beget
 • depraved children.

And, p. 173. Endeavouring to prove that children
 are guilty of their *nearest parents sins*, his first argument
 is this. 'If we are guilty of *Adam's first sin* on that ac-
 • count, because we were *seminally* in him, and are *pre-*
 • *pagated* from him, then are we guilty of our *nearer*
 • *parents sins* on the same account. But the Antecedent
 • is true: ergo, so is the Consequent.

In proof of the Antecedent, p. 174. he speaks thus.
 • It seems clear, that the Doctrine of too many, that
 • lay the *chief or only cause* of man's guilt and punish-
 • ment upon *God's Covenant*, is not sound. They say,
 • God made a Covenant with *Adam* that he should stand
 • or fall for all his posterity, &c. Against this he dis-
 • puts, and brings several arguments for the *confutation*
 of it, p. 175. Notwithstanding 'tis the Doctrine of the
Assembly's Catechism, which grounds the *Imputation* of
Adam's

Adam
venan
made
Poster
Gener
B. th
serts,
ven
as l
first
det
fak
Int
An
It
Gr
are
of
th
far
for
im
G
(
M
(
n
t
n
v
r
c
L
a
M
ir
t
a

Adam's sin, primarily and chiefly on this supposed Covenant, as we learn from Q. 16. The Covenant being made with Adam, not, only for himself, but for all his Posterity, all Mankind descending from him by ordinary Generation sinned in him, &c. But according to Mr. B. there was no such Covenant. Which he again asserts, p. 176. in these words; ' There is no such Covenant of God with Adam mentioned in Scripture as lays the final standing of his Posterity upon that first obedience or disobedience of his; much less that determineth that they shall be judged guilty for his sake of more than they are guilty of indeed, by natural Interest.

And agreeable to this is what he saith, p. 178, 179. ' It being then our *Natural Interest* that is the first Ground of our Guilt of *Adam's* actual Sin, (so far as we are Guilty,) and we being as truly the Children of our nearer Parents, as of him, and *Seminally* in them as well as in him it follows that we have the same *Natural Interest* in their sins as in his, and therefore the same guilt, and reason, why God should impute them to us, &c. p. 179. Moreover as then God might Suppose a *Civil Interest* in *Adam's* sin, (as we were parts future of the same World of Mankind) on presupposition of our natural Interest, (as his offspring,) so now, though our Parents be not the root of Mankind as *Adam* was, (and that's the main Difference, yet) seeing our nearest Parents may be the Root of Families, or other Societies, whereof God is also the Rector, he may suppose another sort of civil Interest or Guilt of their sins upon us. As he imputed *Adam's* sin to us as he was Rector of all Mankind, so may he our nearer Parents, as he is the Ruler of a Family, or of some more remote, as Ruler of a Common-wealth.

Now from these quotations we may learn this, that Mr. B. does not own *Adam* to be a *federal head*, at least in the sense that our other Divines ordinarily do. For they Ground the Imputation of *Adam's* sin Primarily and chiefly, on a supposed covenant made with *Adam*,

as the *Representative head* of Mankind; though not excluding his *natural Headship*, as a means of conveyance. But according to Mr. B. there was no *such Covenant* made with Adam, which makes us guilty of his sin, any further than our *natural Interest* in it does entitle us to. And if this be so, then these Inferences will follow hereupon.

1. That we are guilty of *Adam's first sin*, no more than we are of his 2d. 3d. or *after sins*; especially those that were committed by him whilst we were in his loins: For we had a *natural Interest* in these, as well as the first. And accordingly Mr. B. does allow this Inference: For in his forequoted *disputations* p. 178. where speaking of *Adam's Posterity*, he hath these words. 'God hath not (that I know of) involved them in his first sin any more than in his second or third, &c. whereas the Apostle tells us Ro. 5. 16, 17, 18. That it was by one offence, and by the offence (not offences) of one, that Judgment came on all Men to condemnation. And therefore the Assembly in their *shorter Catechism* do confine our guilt to his first sin, for at Q. 18. they have these words; the *sinfulness of that estate whereinto Man fell consists in the guilt of Adam's first sin*, &c.

2. That we are guilty of the *Actual sins* of our *Immediate Parents*, as well as *Adam's*. For we were *Naturally* (or *Seminally*) in them, as well as in *Adam*. And this also Mr. B. doth acknowledge in his forequoted *Dispute*, p. 178, &c. So that in a sense *Adam* had nothing peculiar to him above other Men, save only that he was the *first Man*, the Father of us all. And,

3. That the Doctrine of *Adam's federal Headship* is altogether *needless*. For if we are guilty of *Adam's sin* no farther than we were *naturally* interested in it, what need is there to suppose any *Covenant* made with *Adam*, as a foundation for this Doctrine?

And as according to Mr. B. *hypothesis*, the Doctrine of *Adam's Federal Headship* is a *needless Doctrine*; so (if I mistake not) he does reject it.

I must

I must confess that in some places, he seems to speak of a *Covenant union* that we had with *Adam*, as well as a *natural*, (see his *Treatise of justifying right*, p. 123.) which *Covenant union*, (for peace sake, because it was the common received Doctrine) he does not wholly exclude (*sensu explanato*;) from being a *Ground* of our Interest in the guilt of *Adam's sin*. (see his *Disput. of Orig. Sin*, p. 177.) And perhaps hence 'twas, that he does not except against that passage in the *shorter Catechism* at Q. 16. (*the Covenant being made with Adam, not only for himself, but for his Posterity, &c.*) when he declares his hearty approbation of that *Catechism*, and the *larger* also (in his *Confession of Faith* p. 14. 18. &c.) with a few Exceptions and Explications.

But if we look to his Explication of this Doctrine in his other books, particularly his *Disputation about Original sin*, &c. we shall find a quite *Different* account of the matter from what our other Divines give, and a *new meaning* put on the terms, even such as is applicable to *immediate Parents*.

That Mr. B. gives a *different Explication* of this matter from our *other Divines* is very apparent.

The *Bishop of Sarum* in his late Exposition of the 39. *Articles*, declaring the Doctrine of our *first Reformers*, and that which is the generally received Opinion of *S. Austin's Disciples*, as to this particular, (*Adam's Federal Headship*;) tells us; that they believe, that God *covenanted* with *Adam* as the *Representative Head* of Mankind, he being a person constituted by God to *represent* them all; and that the *Covenant* was made with him, so that if he had *obeyed* all his *Posterity* should have been happy through his *Obedience*; but by his *Disobedience* they were all to be esteemed to have *sinned* in him, his act being *imputed* and transferred to them all. (See his *Exposition* of the 9th. *Article*, on which I have before made some remark.)

Agreeable hereto is the Doctrine contained in the *Assemblies shorter Catechism*, wherein we are told, that

a Covenant was made with Adam, not only for himself but for all his posterity: on which supposed Covenant they chiefly ground our Interest in the guilt of Adam's first sin, and do only make his natural Headship, or our descending from him by ordinary Generation a necessary prerequisite, and means of conveyance, not the formal cause of our guilt. (See their Answer to Q. 16th, And Mr. Thomas Vincent's Explanation of it.) And consonant hereto is what Mr. Polhil speaks on this head, in his *Spec. Theol.* 210. to 214. I shall quote some passages. At p. 210. he hath these words. *The Covenant made with him, (namely Adam) ran thus: If he did, (as he was able) obey the command he should transfer Innocency and Life to his Posterity; if not, he should transfer sin and death to it. We were in him naturally, as latent in his Loins; and Legally, as comprized within the Covenant. This is very clear, because the Death in the threatening annexed to the Command given to him, falls upon his Posterity. Had not the command extended to his Children, the threatening could not have reached them, in such sort as it doth; that is, in a State of Infancy, void of any actual sin of their own, &c.*

Again p. 213. speaking to that objection, how is it consistent, with justice and equity, that Adam's sin should be imputed to us, that we innocent in our selves, should be guilty by a sin not our own? His answer is, Adam's capacity considered, there is no injustice in it; he was the Head and Root of Mankind, he was the common Trustee of righteousness and immortality for all; the Covenant was made with him for himself and for his Posterity; his sin therefore was not merely his, but ours, &c.

Again p. 214. he hath these words; God dealt with Adam, the head of mankind, upon Terms of Abundant equity: for as Adam sinning was to transfer sin and death to us; so Adam obeying was to transfer righteousness and immortality to us; the terms were equal on both hands; we were in him as our head, as well for the obtaining of blessedness upon his obedience, as for the incurring punishment upon his disobedience.

This

This then is the Doctrine of these Divines, who own *Adam* to be a *Federal head*: they say, that the *first Covenant*, commonly called the *Covenant of Works*, was made with *Adam* as the *Representative head* of Mankind; they ground the Imputation of *Adam's Sin*, *primarily and chiefly* on this supposed *Covenant*; and they also suppose, that if *Adam* had stood, all his *Posterity* should have stood with him, and so should have been confirmed in a state of holiness. For as Mr. Polhil well observes, the terms were equal on both sides. It therefore we were included in *Adam's Covenant* for sin and death upon his disobedience, (which we find by woful experience,) and by that *Covenant* were confirmed in this state, (as doubtless we were,) for that *Covenant* gave no relief, 'tis *Christ* that hath brought in righteousness and Life: I think we may conclude, that we were also included in that *first Covenant*, for righteousness, and life and immortality; and so should have been confirmed in a state of holiness, had *Adam* stood; because the ways of God are equal, God is not more prone to severity than mercy, if we receive evil at the Hand of the Lord, no doubt but we shall receive good proportionably, for certainly the Judge of the whole earth will do right, as *Abraham* argued, *Gen.* 18.

Now all this being included in the common notion of *Adam's* being a *Federal head*, as generally taught by the followers of *S. Austin*; let us see whether Mr. B. has the same apprehensions of this matter. That Mr. B. in some places doth seem to own that there was a *Covenant* made with *Adam* not only for himself, but for his *Posterity*, we readily grant. But the question is, whether he means the same thing by it that others do? And this, I think, may be easily decided from his own explication, wherein we find a very different account of the matter. For according to Mr. B. had *Adam* stood his *Posterity* should not have been confirmed in holiness, or for his sake have been rendred Impeccable. Again, the *Covenant* made with him was not the first ground, and formal cause of our interest in the guilt of *Adam's Sin*, or that which *primarily* and

chiefly makes us guilty. See his *Disput. of Original sin*, p. 175, 178, &c. Neither do I find, that he allows *Adam*, to be the *Representative head* of Mankind, by virtue of any *Covenant* made with him.

He grants indeed, that *Adam* might be a *Political head*, as well as a *Natural*: but this is no more than what may be affirmed of any other *parent*, who is the *head* of a family, or the *Ruler* of a common wealth; as *Mr. B.* himself doth acknowledge p. 179.

He also speaks in some places, (that he might not seem to recede from the common opinion, and be thought singular,) of a *Covenant union* that we had with *Adam*. But I no where find him, in express terms, calling *Adam* a *Federal head*; and according to that explication of this *Covenant* made with *Adam* in behalf of his *Posterity* that he gives, it is no more than what is made with every other *Parent*. For all that he seems to intend by it is this; that *Adam* standing should have conveyed a *holy nature* to his off-spring, but *Adam* sinning should convey to them a *corrupt nature*. And this he would have done, whether there had been any *Covenant* or no. But as for any *Covenant*, that lays the *final standing* of *Adam's Posterity* on *Adam's* obedience or disobedience, or that chargeth on us more guilt, than we should really partake of merely by virtue of our *natural Interest*; this he denies in express terms in the forequoted *Dispute*, p. 176. From whence, I think, it is very apparent, that he does not own *Adam* to be a *Federal head*, in the same sense, that our other Divines ordinarily do.

Yea, according to his explication, he seems to confound *Federal* with *natural*; and ascribes no more to that *Covenant* that was made with *Adam* for himself and for his *Posterity*, than what would really belong to him, as a *natural head*, had not his *Posterity* been included in it. For had *Adam* continued in his state of *Innocency*, he would have produced an *holy off-spring*; and this according to the course of *nature*, which ordains *like* to beget its *like*: and supposing his fall, he must convey unto his natural *Posterity* a nature destitute

tute of *God's Image*; for *Adam* having lost *God's Image* himself could not convey it unto his *Posterity*; because nothing can communicate that to another which it hath not it self.

So then according to *Mr. B's* explication of this *Covenant* made with *Adam*, there was nothing in it that concerned his *Posterity*, but what did naturally belong to them. And so there was nothing peculiar to *Adam* above other *Parents*, save only this, that he was the root and father of us all, (which also was common to him and *Noah*) in other respects all things do equally (at least proportionably) answer in other *Parents*. And accordingly we are told by *Mr. B.* that we are guilty of *Adam's* after sins as well as his first; and of the Actual sins of *Immediate Parents* as well as *Adam's*; and that the ground of our Interest in one and the other is the very same, namely our natural Interest, which is the first ground and formal reason of both; and he also tells us, that there is no such *Covenant* of *God* made with *Adam*, that determines us guilty of more than we are naturally guilty of. See his *Dispute*, p. 176. 178.

Now this being so, I think we may infer, without injury to him, that really and in effect he denies *Adam* to be a *Federal head*, how much so ever in some places he may seem to own it. Thus much for his *Disputations*, &c.

There are other places in *Mr. B's* writings, from whence also we may learn his opinion. See his *Treatise of Justif. right*. p. 123. where are these words. It is an adding to *God's* word and *Covenant*, to say, That he *Covenanted* that *Adam* should personate each one of his *Posterity* in *God's* Imputation or account, any farther than they were naturally in him.

So in his *Poor man's Family book*, (which by the way is a most excellent book, and what I would recommend to all Families, notwithstanding I except against some passages,) speaking there briefly of *Original sin*, he hath these words. (*Edit. 5. p. 413.*) *Adam's* Soul was created, not generated; our Souls are ge-

nerated, and not merely created of nothing. And p. 409.
 ' It is an error, to lay our guilt of *Adam's* sin upon a-
 ' ny such supposed *Covenant Will*, or arbitrary *Imputation*
 ' of God, which chargeth more on us, than we were natu-
 ' rally guilty of. God doth neither make men sinners by
 ' *Imputation*, who are not so in themselves, nor judge
 ' falsely that men did what they did not, &c.

Though Mr. Clifford would make us believe by mul-
 tiplied quotations, that are nothing to his purpose, that
 Mr. B. does agree with the *Assembly* of Divines in their
shorter Catechism, yet if we consider Mr. B's. own words,
 who declares his meaning plain enough to those that
 will consider it, we may easily perceive that there is a
 difference; and come to the knowledge of his Judgment
 in this business, from those above recited sentences, up-
 on which I shall make the following remarks, and so
 conclude this section.

1. Seeing Mr. B. denies *Adam* to be a *Federal head*,
 in this there is an *Agreement* between him and the *Salmu-
 rian Professors*: and therefore Mr. Clifford's disingenuous
 reflection on this occasion is unjust.

2. Seeing he opposeth the *Assemblies Catechism*, which
 grounds the *Imputation* of *Adam's* sin, *Primarily* and
chiefly, on a supposed *Covenant* made with him; and
 determines us guilty of *Adam's* first sin only, not his se-
 cond, third, or after sins; therefore Mr. Clifford did lit-
 tle less than *prevaricate*, when he told the World in his
 former section, that I abused Mr. B. in saying he dif-
 fered from the *Assemblies Catechism*. And,

3. Seeing Mr. B. establisheth the *Imputation* of A-
 dam's sin on no other grounds, but what will equally
 establish the *Imputation* of the sins of immediate Pa-
 rents; I therefore infer, that Mr. Robinson in his pre-
 face is somewhat bold, in telling the world that none
 do establish the *Imputation* of *Adam's* sin so clearly and
 solidly as Mr. B. doth; who in my apprehension does
 undermine the whole Doctrine. And I can't but take
 notice, how Mr. B. himself is puzzled in answering that
Objection, viz. If we are guilty of *Adam's* disobedience,
 because we are his sons, &c. What then shall we say

to Christ? He tells us, that *this objection doth seem more difficult than all the rest, &c.* *Disput. of Orig. sin*, p. 222. whereas according to our Doctrine, there is no great difficulty, for *Adam's sin* is not *meerly imputed* to us, because we are *his Children*, and descend from him, but primarily and chiefly, because he was our *Federal Head* and *Legal Representative*, which he was not to our Saviour Christ.

CHARGE III. Concerning the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness.

§. III. **T**He next accusation, that this Author brings against me, is that I assert, that Mr. B. denying Christ to be a *Legal Representative* quarrels also with the Doctrine of *Imputed righteousness* in more places than one of his writings, and seems to wish that the phrase was expunged out of our Catechism.

This charge this Author manageth, p. 9. &c. and pretends to confute what I say, by some quotations from Mr. B. where he owns both *name* and *thing*. And then triumphs at the close of all in these words, p. 12. Thus I think we have wip'd off the dirt our Author had cast upon Mr. B. about *Imputed righteousness*, and shall leave it to remain with double shame upon his own face, untill he can turn us to those places in Mr. B's. works, where he does quarrel with it, and seems to wish it expunged out of our Catechism, which we believe he will never be able to do.

R E P L Y.

That Mr. B. does quarrel with *Imputed righteousness* or the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness, both *name* and *thing*, I shall prove from his writings. Which if I can do, I hope the *double shame* which this Author has fixt on me, by the consent of all shall be Removed.

First

First as to the *Name*: that Mr. B. does quarrel with, this is plain from his writings. I shall quote three or four places.

In his *Scripture Gospel defended*, p. 22. speaking to that controverſy, *Whether we are juſtified by Chriſt's righteouſneſs imputed to us, and whether the Scriptures ſay ſo?* ſaith he, 'The Scripture oft ſaith, that *faith is imputed to us for Righteouſneſs*, and that is *faith in Chriſt*. And it ſaith, that *righteouſneſs is imputed or reckoned to us*, i. e. we are reckoned or reputed righteous, *Rom. 4. 6, 11, 22. &c.* The words of *Imputing Chriſt's righteouſneſs to us*, I find not in God's word, and therefore think them not neceſſary to the Churches peace or ſafety.

In his *Treatiſe of Juſtifying righteouſneſs*, p. 53. he there lays down this propoſition, 'The phraſe of (*Chriſt's righteouſneſs imputed to us*,) is not in the Scripture. And, p. 57. He ſpeaks thus; it is not the wiſdom nor impartiality of ſome men, who greatly cry up the Scripture perfection, and decry the addition of a Ceremony or form in the worſhip of God; that yet think religion is endangered, if our Confeſſion uſe not the phraſes of (*God's imputing our ſin to Chriſt, and his imputing Chriſt's righteouſneſs to us*,) when neither of them is in Scripture.

So in his *End of Doctrinal Controverſies*, p. 259. ſpeaking to that Q. *Whether imputing Chriſt's righteouſneſs to us be a Scripture phraſe?* Anf. Not that I can find. And that is all he ſaith to it.

So in his *Treatiſe of the life of faith*, p. 349. *The Scripture no where ſaith, that Chriſt, or his Righteouſneſs, or his obedience, or his Satisfaction is imputed to us.*

Now in all theſe places he plainly ſays that the *Imputation of Chriſt's righteouſneſs is no Scripture phraſe*, whereas we have expreſs mention of *Imputed righteouſneſs* in more places than one, and the context ſheweth that 'tis meant of *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs*, 'Rom. 4. 6. Even as David alſo deſcribeth the bleſſedneſs of the man unto whom God imputeth righteouſneſs without works. Whoſe righteouſneſs doth God impute to ſuch perſons? Why, either their

their own or anothers. Not *their own*, because 'tis a righteousness *without works*: whereas if it had been *their own righteousness* that was *imputed*, this would have been a righteousness *by works*, not *without them*. The righteousness therefore that is said to be imputed in this place is *another's* righteousness, not *their own*. And if we ask *whose* righteousness? The answer is, *Christ's*. For there is no other righteousness besides *Christ's* and *our own*, that is pleaded in this business. Yea the Apostle himself puts the matter beyond all doubt, and explains it of *Christ's righteousness* in the following Chap. *Ro. 5. 18, 19.* *Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to Condemnation: even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience (namely Adam's) many were made sinners: so by the obedience of one (namely Christ) shall many be made righteous.* If any ask, how were we made sinners by *Adam's* disobedience? The answer is, by the *Imputation* of his sin to us. That formal act, that he committed, in a *Legal* or judicial sence, is accounted ours, he being our *Representative*. And the same we say of *Christ's righteousness*, we are made righteous through the *Imputation* of *Christ's* righteousness, his *formal righteousness*, for so runs the parallel. So that this term, the *Imputation* of *Christ's* righteousness is a *Scripture phrase*, at least by consequence. And consequence from *Scripture* is *Scripture*.

Agreeable to this is what *Mr. Troughton* saith to this purpose in his *Luth. Red.* part 2. p. 97. where he speaks to this objection.

' *Object.* These Authors unanimously complain, that the *Scripture* no where saith in express words, that *Christ's righteousness* is imputed to us.

' *Ans.* All Scholars know, that this is the first cavil of *Innovators* to weaken the faith of the unwary. For themselves grant, this concludeth not; it is not read expressly in *Scripture*, therefore it is not the *Doctrine of the Scriptures*: I say themselves grant it, as in express terms in other Questions, so by their practice in the *Present* controversy, they having new moulded
' Divinity

Divinity in this last age, and put it into new terms, and unknown both to Scripture and Antiquity. They that complain of us for insisting upon the term of *Imputation of Christ's Righteousness*, as not contained expressly in Scripture, ought in all justice and prudence to have shewed us first the Chapters and verses where their terms of *Condition*, *causa sine qua non*, first and Second *Justification*, *remediating law*, and the like are to be found. Moreover they know, that *Imputation of Righteousness* is a Scripture term ten times used in the 4th. to the *Romans*, and that *Righteousness* is said to be imputed without works, to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, v. 4. Therefore, this righteousness cannot be a man's own obedience. And also that Christ is said in Scripture to be our *Righteousness*, made of God's righteousness to us, and we made the righteousness of God in him; which are equivalent to his righteousness being imputed to us.

Again in his *Preface* to his first part, shewing the rise of this new *Doctrine* that is broached among us, and the various arts whereby it is propagated, among other this is one, their quarrelling with this phrase, the *Imputation of Christ's righteousness*, that it is no Scripture phrase. I shall quote his own words.

This subject, how we shall be justified before God, is the chief and weightiest part in practical Divinity; our hope of Salvation, our encouragement to obedience, our direction how to come to God, to trust in him, to pray to and worship him, all depend upon the right knowledge of this; in what way and by what means he will be reconciled to us, and treat with us in order to life Eternal. That this was only by our trusting in the Promise of life, grounded upon the Righteousness of Christ wrought for us, and made ours to the use of justifying by believing, all the Protestant Churches were unanimously agreed, &c. till the Dutch Arminians shook, and almost overturned, the whole Doctrine of the Reformation. These men began to teach, that we are justified by faith as the Condition of the Gospel, even as obedience was the condition of the law :

' law : that not *Christ's Righteousness*, but the *to credere*
 ' is imputed to us as *our Righteousness*, for which we
 ' are accepted and saved. Afterwards they took *obe-*
 ' *dience* into the *condition* of the new Covenant, &c.
 ' This Doctrine together with their opinions about
 ' grace, came into England about 40 years since : but
 ' in the late confusion some men having taken it up as
 ' the best means, to oppose the *Antinomians*, and ha-
 ' ving drest it up in more *Scripturall language*, and made
 ' it look and speak as if it were very much for *holiness*,
 ' whatever it be for *grace*, it hath of late diffused it self
 ' amongst men of all persuasions, forms and modes a-
 ' mong us : and yet it is no other than the old *Papish*
 ' *Doctrine* divested of its School terms, &c.

' If it might be hoped, that our late writers speak on-
 ' ly from their various sence and experience, without
 ' any design of bringing in a *new Doctrine* of Justi-
 ' fication, they might be better born with : but the
 ' contrary is too evident, that there is a design to *shame*,
 ' and so to suppress the *old Doctrine* of Justification by
 ' *faith*, and the *Imputation of Christ's Righteousness*, &c.
 ' And they manage it with *various arts*. Sometimes
 ' they pretend to differ only in *words*, and that *Calvin*
 ' with all the old writers were of the same mind. Some-
 ' times they are all for reconciling the *verbal*, or need-
 ' less differences of Christians, for making *peace*,
 ' which they only *broke* ; and this must be by believing
 ' according to *their notions*, and speaking in *their terms*.
 ' Otherwhiles they quarrel, that *Christ's Righteousness*
 ' is not said in Scripture to be imputed to us *totidem*
 ' *verbis* ; tho he be exprelly called *our Righteousness*,
 ' and we read of righteousness being imputed, and being
 ' found in him, not having *our own righteousness*. These
 ' are the *Common arts* of them, that labour to bring a
 ' *received truth* first to be *disputed*, and then to be
 ' *suspected*. But they cannot stop here, they cannot
 ' forbear saying, the Doctrine of *Imputation* is *Ridi-*
 ' *culous* ; that the sence of all our *Reformed writers*,
 ' and *Universities*, *Confessors* and *Martyrs* is *absurd*,
 ' *irrational*,

* irrational, yea Nonsense, &c. But to return to my Opponent.

Another place in Mr. B's writings, where we find him quarrelling with this term, and wishing it expunged out of our Catechism, is his *Catholick Theology*, l. 2. p. 252 where treating of *Imputed righteousness*, and how faith is imputed to *Righteousness*? faith he, where does the Scripture say, that Christ's righteousness is imputed to us? And p. 254. He hath these words; 'I would it could be hid from the world, that these words, are not only in the *Independent Savoy Confession*, but even in the *Confession of the Westminster Assembly*, Chap. 11. (not by imputing faith it self, the act of believing or any other Evangelical obedience to them as their Righteousness, but by imputing the obedience and Satisfaction of Christ to them.)

So in his *Treatise of Justifying righteousness*, p. 25. faith he, 'The Brethren called Congregational or Independent in their meeting at the *Savoy*, Octo. 12. 1658. Publishing a declaration of their faith. Chap. 11. have these words. [Those whom God effectually calleth, he also freely justifieth, not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous, not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone, not by imputing faith it self, the act of believing, or any other Evangelical obedience to them as their righteousness, &c.]

This confession of theirs, so far as I have quoted it, is exactly the same with the *Westminster Confession*, Chap. 11. §. 1. And yet Mr. B. in that place reflects on it, as drawn up by those, who had some inclination to Antinomian principles, and so wounds the Reverend *Westminster Assembly* through their sides. Yea, p. 26. he does acknowledge that the *Westminster Assembly* does speak as they do, as to that clause, (not by imputing faith it self, the act of believing, or any other Evangelical righteousness to them as their righteousness,) which clause he tells us in express terms had better been left out. His words are these, And the same words are in the *Assemblies*

blies Confession, tho they might better have been left out.

So in Mr. B's. life, drawn up by himself, where speaking of the *Independents*, at p. 104. he hath these words.

' They drew up a *Confession* of their faith, and the
' order of their Church Government. In the former ;
' they thought it not enough expressly to contradict, S.
' James, and to say unlimitedly, that we are justified by
' the righteousness of Christ only, and not by any works :
' but they contradicted, St. Paul also, who saith, that
' faith is imputed for righteousness : and not only so,
' but they expressly asserted, that we have no other righte-
' ousness, but that of Christ ; a Doctrine abhorred by
' all the Reformed and Christian Churches.

Mr. B. (had he pleased) might have said the same of the *Westminster Assembly*, who expressly teach the same Doctrine, in the two first branches of it. And as to the other last clause, (that we have no other righteousness but that of Christ.) it is evident from the place, that they are speaking of *Constitutive Justifying righteousness*. And in this respect, I think we have no other righteousness to depend on. And if I mistake not, this also is the Doctrine of the *Westminster Assembly* in their Confession, ch. 11. §. 1, 2. and larger Catechism, Q. 70, 73. And of the Church of England in her Articles and Homilies. See Article 11. and the book of Homilies, Tom. 1. Sermon of Salvation, p. 16, 17. And, Tom. 2. Sermon of the Passion, p. 187. where are these words.

' The only Mean and Instrument of Salvation required
' of our part, is faith, that is to say, a sure trust and
' confidence in the mercies of God ; whereby we per-
' swade our selves, that God both hath and will forgive
' our sins, &c. not for our merits or deserts, but only and
' solely for the merits of Christ's death and Passion, &c.

We also find Mr. B. quarrelling with this Doctrine in other places, particularly in his Confession of faith, p. 18. where speaking to that Clause in the *Assemblies larger Catechism*, at Q. 73. (nor as if the grace of faith or any act thereof were imputed to him for his justification,) saith he,

he, ' I will never subscribe these words, nor any like
 ' them without the liberty of an explication, when they
 ' are expressly *in terminis* contrary to the Scripture, and
 ' must have such an Interpretation to reconcile the sense.
 ' Nor will I ever approve of such passages in Catechisms
 ' and Confessions, as shall determine a point expressly
 ' against the word of God, tho *Hereticks* might abuse
 ' those words.

Now judge, *Reader*, whether I have *abused* Mr. B. in
 saying he *quarrels* with the *Imputation* of Christ's righte-
 ousness, and seems to wish that the phrase was *expunged*
 out of our Catechism, seeing passages of this nature do
 to frequently occur in Mr. B's. writings. And what now
 is become of this *Author's double shame*, which he fixt on
 me, till I could produce these places; which it seems,
 tho he tells us that he is no *stranger* to Mr. B's. works,
 he either forgot, or notwithstanding that *strict observa-*
tion he makes on what he reads, he never took any notice
 of?

It better becomes this *grave Author*, that talks so much
 of a *long beard*, to study Mr. B. a little better, before
 he enter on his publick defence. Did I take the same
 liberty to *expose* him on all *just* occasions, as he does to
expose me on *no just* occasion, he has given me sufficient
 advantage. But I delight not in so *dirty* an argument.

Secondly, let us examine, whether Mr. B. does own
 the *thing*. We mistrust the *Socinians*, when they quar-
 rel with the *name* of Trinity, pretending it is not a
Scripture expression. Whereas in truth they quarrel
 not with it, because it is an *unapt* expression to set forth
 the Doctrine we own, but because they love not *our Do-*
ctrine. And so in like manner, when other persons do
quarrel with those Common and received *names*, that
 the Church has used of a long time in explaining her Do-
 ctrine, it gives some jealousy, that *Latet anguis in herba*,
 and that could they speak out, they would deny the
things themselves. Whether this be not the case of Mr. B.
 let the following arguments be considered.

Arg. 1. If Mr. B. does own the *Imputation* of Christ's
 righteousness in its *effects* only, this is in effect to deny
 the

the whole Doctrine. For imputation of a thing in its effects only, is indeed no Imputation of that thing to us, as I shall illustrate in these following instances. The Incarnation of the Son of God is imputed to us as to the effects of it; but Christ's incarnation is not imputed, we are not reputed to be incarnate as he was; that is impossible. Again, what Christ did in his Mediatorial office, as Prophet and King, wherein he acted from God toward us, is imputed to us in the effects of it, we have benefit by it. But we are not judicially reputed to have done what he did, as Prophet and King, because in those offices, he did not act from us toward God, or as our Surety and Representative. Once more, we are made partakers of the effects and benefits of Christ's intercession; yet who ever said that the acts thereof are imputed to us, or that we are reputed to intercede in him? The Socinians themselves will own this, that we have benefit by Christ's Obedience and Suffering, and that his righteousness in this sense, namely in its effects, is imputed to us; who yet stily oppose the Imputation of Christ's righteousness in the Orthodox sense. If therefore Mr. B. does only contend for the Imputation of Christ's righteousness in the effects of it, he does plainly deny the imputation of the thing it self. And yet this is the case, as is plain from his writings. See his *Methodus Theologiae*, Part 3. p. 309. Where speaking to that Q. *Quenam Christi justitia nobis imputatur?* i. e. what righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, &c. In answer hereto he speaks thus, *Si in quaestione de sensu Imputationis erratur, hac etiam inexplicabilis erit.* i. e. If we err about the sense of Imputation, this Question will be inexplicable. Therefore that we may know what he means by it, he explains himself a little lower in these words, *Christi justitia non in se, sed in effectis fit nostra*, i. e. The righteousness of Christ is made ours (or imputed to us) not in it self, but in its effects. So in his *Treatise of justifying righteousness*, p. 5. Stating this Q. *Whether Christ's righteousness, Habitual, Active and Passive be strictly made our own righteousness, in the very thing it self, simply imputed to us, or only be made ours in the effects*

fects &c. saith he, the last is affirmed, the first is denied. So p. 59. Speaking to this Q. *Whether Christ's material righteousness, i. e. his Habits, acts and Sufferings themselves be ours by Divine imputation?* saith he, 'there is but one of these two ways left, either that we our selves in person truly had the habits which Christ had, and did all that Christ did, and suffered all that he suffered, and so Satisfied and merited life in and by him, as by an Instrument or Legal Representer of our persons in all this, which I am anon to confute. Or else that Christ's Satisfaction, righteousness, and the habits, acts and sufferings in which it lay, are imputed to us and made ours, not rigidly in the very thing it self, but in the effects and benefits, in as much as we are really pardoned, justified adopted by them, as the meritorious cause, by the instrumentality of the Covenants of donation, &c.

From these quotations it is very evident, that Mr. B. denies the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness it self. And whereas he is pleased to keep our terms in explaining this Doctrine, and to own the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness, *Sensu Explanation* in the effects of it, there is no *Arminian*, or *Socinian*, that will oppose the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness, in this sense, namely in its effects; for these also own that we have benefit by it; tho they go on different foundations, and do not ascribe so much to Christ's death as Mr. B. does.

Arg. 2. If Christ's righteousness be imputed to us to *Justification* no otherwise than it is to *Sanctification*, then it is not imputed at all. For we don't say, that Christ's righteousness is imputed to *Sanctification*. We make a distinction between the *Righteousness* of *Justification* and *Sanctification*. One is without us, the other within us. One is Christ's righteousness made ours, by *imputation* on God's part and *faith* on our part; the other is our own righteousness, wrought out by our selves, under the influence of God's spirit. One we call *Imputed*, the other *Inherent*. But now according to Mr. B. our *Inherent* righteousness is our *Justifying* righteousness, as shall be shown under the next Section; and according to him, the righteousness

ness of Christ is imputed to believers for Justification, all
 one as it is to Sanctification, respecting both, only as a
 remote meritorious cause. See his *Treatise of Justif.*
right. p. 52. Christ's righteousness is imputed to believers
 in the 6th sense, here before explained, as the meritorious
 cause of our Pardon, Justification, Adoption, Sanctificati-
 on and Salvation, &c. So in his *Poor man's family book*,
 p. 429. The remission of sin is the other part of the Sal-
 vation of the Church, the fruit of Christ's blood, and the
 gift of his Covenant, as Sanctification is the work of his
 Spirit. Here the blood of Christ, or the righteousness
 of Christ is the remote meritorious cause of both. So in
 his *Scripture Gospel def.* p. 32. Speaking to that Q. Doth
 not Christ's righteousness cause our Sanctification in the
 same sort of Causality as it causeth our Justification?
 Ans. The effects are divers, but both from the same
 meritorious cause. According to Mr. B. Christ by his
 righteousness hath merited for us the new Covenant, our
 conformity whereto in Sanctification is our Justifying
 righteousness; and Christ also hath merited the holy Spi-
 rit, whereby we are enabled to conform unto the new
 Covenant. So that Christ's righteousness respects our
 justification in the same kind of causality, as it does
 our Sanctification, having relation unto both as a remote
 meritorious cause. And consequently it is not imputed
 to us; for we don't use to say, that the righteousness of
 Christ is imputed to us for Sanctification.

Arg. 3. If Christ was not a *Legal Representative*, then
 there is no solid foundation left for the Imputation of
 Christ's righteousness to us. For this Doctrine is found-
 ed on the other; and therefore those that deny one do
 also usually deny the other, as I shew in my *Disput.* p.
 417, 448, &c. But according to Mr. B. Christ was
 not a *Legal Representative*. See his *Treat. of Univ.*
Rad. p. 33, 67. His *Scripture Gospel def.* p. 23. Where
 he saith, that the strict fence Subverteth the Summ of all
 the Gospel and religion, as he saith he hath more fully
 proved in his *Treas. of Justif. right.* where also he opposeth
 this Doctrine, particularly, p. 87, 107, &c. Now this
 Doctrine of Christ's being a proper Representative, being
 strenuously opposed by Mr. B. he undermines the whole

Doctrine of *Imputation*, in that sense that our first *Reformers*, and our other *Divines* plead for it. And therefore Mr. B. is so far from *establishing* this Doctrine more *clearly* and *solidly* than other men, that in my apprehension, he *undermines* the whole Doctrine.

That Mr. B. keeps our *terms* in many places of his writings I readily grant, and good reason there was for it, least he should incur the publick *odium*, by an open departure from the old Protestant Doctrine. This was the observation of Mr. John Troughton in his *Lutherus Redivivus*, where disputing in particular against Mr. Baxter, Mr. Hotchkis, and Mr. Truman, he tells us in his *Preface* to his *Second Part*, that they not only endeavour to obscure and Perplex the Question what they can, always proposing it in *such terms*, that it may seem they dispute only against the *Antinomians*, or some that have spoken too like them; but they also endeavour to *hide* their own meaning from the Common people, for the *saving* of their own credit. Hence (saith he) they tell us, that the term of *Imputation of Righteousness*, is still to be retained, that Christ meriteth our *Justification*, that he is our *Legal* or *Prolegat* righteousness, &c. They speak as like our *Orthodox Divines* as they can, that it may not commonly appear wherein they differ: yet in all this they mean no more, but that Christ by his obedience, or death or both, obtained a new Covenant for us, i. e. The *Evangelical law*, which if we fulfil, and continue in it to the end of our lives, we shall have our sins pardoned, shall be accepted and saved. So that the righteousness, for which we shall be accepted, and made heirs of eternal life, is our obedience to the Gospel, not the obedience or righteousness of Jesus Christ; and with them the *Imputing* of Christ's righteousness to us for *Justification*, is our being justified by our own obedience to the Gospel Covenant, which Christ procured by his righteousness.

Now according to this account of the matter, they deny the thing, tho they keep the name.

Whether Mr. B. did retain the name of *Imputed righteousness*, or the *Imputation of Christ's righteousness*, to save his credit, as Mr. Troughton saith, I will
not

not determine. Yet this I have observed in more places than one of his writings, how himself has acknowledged, that he was loath to *seem to recede* from others, and to give offence by going out of the common road. See his 4 *Disput. about Justification*, p. 233, &c. And perhaps hence 'tis, that we read so much of *Imputed righteousness* in Mr. B's. works: upon which account he had an answer ready to all that should charge him with *opposing* this Doctrine, tho in truth he denied all proper *Imputation*.

This seems to be the case between him and Dr. Tully, which I mention here, because my Opponent, to put matters beyond all doubt, (that Mr. B. never quarrelled with the Doctrine of *Imputed righteousness*,) brings a quotation from his own writings, in answer to Dr. Tully, who charged him with it. This quotation we have in Mr. Cl. *Defence*, &c. p. 12. in these words.

' If I have 1. Never written one word against *Imputation of righteousness* there (that is in his *Aphorisms*) or elsewhere. 2. Yea have oft written for it. 3. And if those very Pages be for it, which he *accuseth*. 4. Yea, if there and elsewhere I wrote more for it &c. than those great Divines, who are for the *Imputation* only of the Passive righteousness of Christ, when I profess there, and often, to concur with Mr. Bradshaw, Grotius and others, that take in the *active* also; yea, and the *habitual*, yea and the *Divine* respectively, as advancing the merits of the humane: if all this be *notoriously true*, what *Epithets* will you give, to this *Doctors notorious untruth*?

Ans. Instead of giving a new Answer, I shall only transcribe what Mr. Troughton saith to it, in his *Latb. Red.* part 2. p. 103, &c. where he begins with this preface.

' Of all that ever troubled the Church with their Errors, the *Pelagians* and their late offspring the *Arminians*, have most perplexed it with their opinions: partly by their *importunity*, reviving them and urging them afresh from time to time, so that the Church hath had little quiet from them for the last Twelve

hundred years, though their opinions have been most frequently and most fairly examined, and unanimously refused above any Errors whatsoever, and that both by particular writers of all ages, and also many synods greater and smaller; but principally by their dishonest art of *misrepresenting* the *Orthodox* Doctrine, to persuade the simple, that they oppose particular mens sentiments, not the Doctrine of the Church, and by covering their own opinions, propounding them plausibly and *Ambiguously*, that the falshood may not be easily discerned, that at once they many *insinuate* with the simple, and have *retreats* to avoid the arguments of the learned, wherein they do like those that sculk in woods and thickets, whom it is as hard to find out, as it is to conquer. It was a fit Epithet, that *Jerome* gave *Pelagius*, *Coluber ille Britannus*, that British snake: for he had his many windings and foldings, and for his advantage could cast his skin too. When he was taxed to deny *grace*, ascribing all to man's *free will*, he protested to ascribe all to *grace*, and yet meant thereby nothing but *nature* or *freewill*, which he called *grace*, because it was the gift of God, &c.

Arminius and his followers have not come behind them in this art. The *Preface* to the *Synod of Dort*, and *Lubertus* sufficiently inform us, how *Arminius* strove to cover his opinions, till he might by secret insinuations gain a party to stand on his defence, &c. By the same art, their followers amongst us at this day create as much trouble, especially in this point of Justification by *Christ's Righteousness Imputed*, about which they had their Doctrine from *Arminius*, &c. They do agree to retain the term of *Imputing Christ's righteousness*. The notion of *Imputation* in general (saith one of them) is no way to be opposed, it being impossible that we should receive *benefits* by, and the *effects* of what another doth, without some kind of *Imputation*. (Just. Evang. p. 51.) But thus *Socius* will say, what *Christ* did was *imputed* to us, &c. it was *nostra bene*, for our good and benefit.

Mr. Baxter

Mr. Baxter chargeth Dr. Tully with the breach of all that is sacred, for saying that he denieth all *Imputation of Christ's righteousness*, and telleth us, that he doth not only hold it in some sense, but in a larger sense than many do, viz. That not only his *Passive* obedience is imputed to us, but his *Active* also, yea his *Habitual* and *Divine* righteousness, so far as influential to give merit to his obedience: and yet all this is but words, &c. For he that useth a Common word, as this of (*Imputation*) is, in a sense quite different from the common acception, and state of the Question, does but *equivocate* in retaining that term. The Protestants have differed about the *righteousness* of Christ Imputed whether it be the *Passive* only, or the *Active* also; yet till of late there hath been no Question among them about the meaning of the term *Imputation*: all understanding thereby, that we were justified and accepted to life Eternal for the *righteousness of Christ* intended and wrought for us.

But it is more strange that he, who is so earnest to be accounted a maintainer of *Imputation* should no better defend himself from the accusation of denying it. For when a few lines would have expressed any mans meaning in this point, who was willing to be understood, he gives us many *Distinctions*, *Divisions*, and *Subdivisions*, and fifty propositions to explain in what sense he holdeth Christ's *righteousness* imputed, and in what not, (*Treat. of Just. right. ch. 2. p. 48. &c.*) and yet confesseth after all these, that he doubteth he hath not made his meaning plain enough, to those who are not exercised in the controversy, who find most need of his Explanation, and therefore addeth more *distinctions* and *propositions* to make his meaning plainer, (*ch. 3. p. 79.*) which is as well performed, as if a man endeavouring to wash an *Ethiopian* white, should first plunge him into a river of water, and afterwards into a well of Ink.

He goes on with the same art, (*chap. 4. p. 89.*) and instead of opposing the *Doctors* sense of *Imputation*, and defending his own, he thrusts together all the

sences of *Imputation*, which he denieth, both the *sound* and the *unsound*, and then disputes against *Imputation* with *forty three reasons*: but against what or in what sence he would not have the people, but only his friends to understand. If this be *reconciling*, to devise new terms and new Questions, if *confounding* things be clearing of them, if *hiding* ones meaning with multitude of words be to explain ones self, then this Author hath acquitted himself well. So far he.

Now that we also may put matters beyond all doubt, that Mr. B. denied the Common Doctrine of the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness, and did not mean the same thing by *imputed righteousness*, as our other *Divines* ordinarily do, appears not only from what has been said, but likewise from this argument; because he opposeth Dr. Owen's, explication, and saith he owns the *Subverting sence*, that overthroweth the whole Gospel, because he pleads for the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness, in the same sence as our *first Reformers*.

That Dr. Owen in his *Treatise of Justification*, (where he confutes Mr. B's Doctrine, tho he does not name him,) is of the same opinion with our *first Reformers*, and the *Assembly* of *Divines* in their *Catechism*, and those worthy *Divines*, whose names I mention in my *Disput*. Bishop *Usher*, &c. I take for granted, till I hear it disproved. And yet Mr. B. does implicitly call him a *Subverter of the Gospel*, for no other reason, but maintaining this Doctrine. See his *Scrip. Gof. Def.* p. 97, 109, &c. Where making a reply to Mr. Lobb, who had sent Mr. B. an *Epitome* of Dr. Owen's book of *Justification*, desiring his judgment thereupon, in answer to him, and speaking particularly to that passage, viz. (that *Christ's perfect righteousness is made the righteousness of believers, and is accordingly judged, esteemed and reputed theirs, being by free gift made theirs to all ends and purposes, whereto it would have served if it had been their own, without any such Imputation, donation or communication, and God dealeth with them accordingly*.) Saith Mr. B. In this explication you farther own the *Subverting sence*. This is plainer dealing than we had before.

If this were true, 1. *We are as righteous as Christ*, 2. *We may deny that ever we were sinners*, &c. And thus he goes on to expose this Doctrine, in no less than 20 pretended absurdities, concluding all thus; 'p. 111. So much to your *Epitome*, which it I wrong you by judging it all your own, it is long of your self, that own it as aforesaid in the gross; if the *Doctor* be wronged, it is by you and not by me.

From the whole it appears that Mr. B. is not of the same judgment with our *first Reformers*, as to this point of Justification by the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness.

I know some tell us, that the whole bustle in this controversy is but a *Logomachy*. But to me there appears a *real* difference in several respects. I shall name some.

1. Our *first Reformers* held Christ to be a *Legal representative*, and thereon grounded the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness in *Justification*. Mr. B. does expressly reject this, and saith that Christ was not a *Legal Representative*.

2. Our *first Reformers* held the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness *it self*, his *formal righteousness*, that conformity he yielded to our law, which he put himself under by his *voluntary* sponson. Mr. B. denies Christ to have fulfilled our law, as our surety, and does expressly reject this Doctrine, (*viz. the Imputation of Christ's righteousness it self*;) and pleads for the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness in *its effects only*, which some think is *no Imputation*.

3. There is a difference in the very notion of *Justification*. Mr. B. placeth the formal nature of that *Justification* we have by Christ, (or upon the account of Christ's righteousness,) only in *remission*; saying we are justified at the bar of the Gospel by our *own righteousness*. (See his *Aphorisms* at thes. 28. his *Confession of Faith*, p. 52, 56. his 4. *Disput. of Justif.* p. 371. and his *Debate with Mr. Cartwright*, p. 29, 162, &c.) But other Divines, and particularly the *Assembly* in their *Shorter Catechism* do make it to consist not only in *pardon*, but in the acceptance of

a sinner as righteous in God's sight, through the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness to him. So at Q. 33.

Now either my *Opponent* knew all this that Mr. B. (tho in some places he keeps our terms, yet) does not mean the *same thing* as other Divines and our first Reformers; or he did not. If he did, how grossly and dishonourably does he *prevaricate*, in pretending that Mr. B. is of the same opinion with our first Reformers and the Assembly of Divines in their *Catechism*, quoting divers places from Mr. B's writings for the proof of it, where he useth the term *imputed righteousness*, when he knew that he meant not the *same thing* by it? And if he did not know this; he justly falls under Mr. Robinson's, Censure in his *Epistle to the Reader*, (tho designed for others) of *meddling with matters he don't understand*.

CHARGE IV, and V. Concerning the place of faith and works in Justification.

§. IV. **T**He next thing that this Author lays to my Charge is, that I assert, that Mr. B. makes Faith and obedience to be all one, and that he pleads for Justification (particularly in his *Aphorisms* and other places,) by faith it self, not Relatively and Instrumentally Considered, &c.

R E P L Y.

Before I shall consider the several particulars, mentioned by this Author in managing this charge, I shall briefly recite my own words, which were brought in after this manner. Having shewn that Mr. B. denies Christ to be a *Legal Representative*, and having thence inferred that then the *Imputation of Christ's righteousness* to Justification will be rejected; my next sentence was this, p 417. If *imputed righteousness* be rejected, then we must establish our own righteousness in Justification. Accord-

Accordingly Mr. B. (if I apprehend him) makes faith and obedience to be all one, and pleads for Justification, (particularly in his *Aphorisms* and other places,) by faith itself, not relatively and instrumentally considered; understanding by faith, obedience to the whole Gospel; making no distinction between faith and Gospel works, whereas the Scripture does distinguish, Eph. 2. 8, 9.

From these words my Opponent finds matter for two accusations, managed by him in two distinct Sections, tho both tend to the same thing, and are both taken from one sentence; so industrious is he, to heap up matters to lay to my charge.

First he accuseth me as misrepresenting Mr. B. to the world, because I say in my *disput.* that, (if I apprehend him,) he makes faith and obedience to be all one; whereas this Author does pretend to prove from Mr. B's. writings, that he owns a difference. This charge we have, p. 12.

R E P L Y

We must distinguish. In different respects the same thing compared with another may be said to be one and the same with it, and different from it, and all this without Contradiction; because *omnis oppositio est respectu ejusdem*. Tho Mr. B. according to this Author, does make a difference between faith and obedience, understanding by faith our first Consent to the Gospel-Covenant, and by obedience our after performance; resembling their difference to the first consent to the Marriage-relation, and the conjugal fidelity and obedience of the wife after Marriage: yet he himself in some respects does own them to be one. They agree in this, namely in the general nature of obedience, both of them being acts of obedience, as Mr. B. sheweth in his *Scripture Gospel defended*, p. 46. And therefore this Author, before he fixt his reproach on me, and published to the world that I was mistaken, and have falsely accused Mr. B. should have distinguished. For in some sense my words are true, Mr. B. being judge. And in this sense already mentioned we do not differ from Mr. B. There is
no

no body but will own, that faith is an act of *obedience* to God, seeing it is a Gospel duty, commanded by God, 1 *Joh.* 3. 23.

But then there is another meaning wherein faith and obedience may be said to be *one*, namely as faith is considered not merely in the nature of a *Gospel Duty*, but in its office of *justifying*. And so the Question between us is this, whether faith doth *justify* in its absolute consideration, as a *working* grace, as an act of *obedience*? This is the controversy between us and Mr. B. We say, it justifies not *absolutely* considered, as our act, but as it is *Relatively* and *Instrumentally* considered, as it takes in its object, Christ and his righteousness, which faith apprehends. And so in our sense, to be justified by faith, is to be justified by *Christ's righteousness apprehended by faith*. This is the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, as before shewn. This also is the judgment of the Assembly of Divines in their *Confession*, chap. 11. §. 1, 2. And in their larger *Catechism*, where, in answer to that Q. *How does faith justify, &c?* They speak thus, *Faith justifies a sinner in the sight of God, not as if the grace of faith, or any act thereof were imputed to him for his justification, but only as it is an Instrument, by which he receiveth and applieth Christ and his righteousness.*

Now of this mind is not Mr. B. and therefore we find him in more places than one of his writings, particularly in his *Scripture Gospel* def. p. 39. *End of Doctrinal controversies*, p. 273. and other places, quarrelling with the term *Instrument*, which the *Assembly* useth in this business, and is an apt expression to set forth their meaning, seeing they teach that 'tis *Christ's righteousness*, and not merely our faith, that is our justifying righteousness. We also find him expressing his dislike of the *Assemblies* Doctrine as to this particular, in divers places, in his *Catholick Theology*, p. 254. And in his *Treatise of justifying righteousness*, p. 26. as hath been shewn in the foregoing section. We also find him rejecting that noted and Common *Distinction*, so frequently used in explaining this Doctrine, of faith *Absolutely* and *Relatively* considered, at least putting another meaning on it: and therefore

therefore my *Opponent* in his *def.* p. 16. pretends that he doth not *understand* our meaning.

From all which it is a strong presumption, that Mr. B. makes faith to justify in its *absolute* consideration, as an act of obedience; and so in this sense, (namely with respect to the *use* and *office* of faith in justifying,) he makes *faith* and *obedience* to be all one, which was all I meant in my *Dispute*. And wherein then have I falsely accused Mr. B. as to this particular?

This Author might easily have known my meaning, from the very sentence he carps at. For I explain my self in it. Having said that Mr. B. *makes faith and obedience to be all one*, I immediately add, (*and pleads for Justification by faith it self, not relatively and instrumentally considered.*) In which words I shew in what sense, I apprehend he makes them to be *one*, namely in their *use* and *office* of justifying, both justifying as *acts of obedience*, being made *Conditions* under that notion.

Either this Author is able to *distinguish*, when he goes on in this *confused* manner; or he is not. If he *is not*; he should have *forborn* to have meddled in the matter, least he should *Ignorantly* abuse his Brother, by *charging* false accusations on him, which when searched to the *bottom* are no such thing. Or if he is *able* to *distinguish*, and put things in a clearer light, (to which more is required, by his leave, than *knowing the right hand from the left.*) I must needs say, he has not done it in this book; which is little else but a mere jumble of *impertinent* quotations and *Scurrillous* reflections; scarce one thing in it fairly *stated*, or rightly *applied*; all things being manage with abundance of *confidence* in a *general* way, forgetting or not knowing, that *Delus laiet in Generalibus, & Qui bene distinguit bene docet.*

I am not *singular* as to this point, in charging those, with making *faith* and *obedience* to be *one*, who give the same *office* to both in justifying. There is a *late Author* of the Church of England, who published his book about the same time that mine came forth and on the same design, to bear his testimony against the *Arminian* corruptions

corruptions of the age, as to this point about *Justification*. And he also makes his observation that these modern Gentlemen do make *faith* and *works* to be all one. For in his *Preface* having quoted Bishop Hall, expostulating with *Arminius* upon his up-start Doctrine, after this manner. 'If it be a truth thou affectest, what, alone? Could never any eyes till shine be blessed with this object? Where has that sacred verity hid her self thus long, from all her careful Inquisitors, that she now first shows her head to thee unsought? Has the Gospel shined thus long and bright, and left some corners unseen? Away with all new trunks fair: and plausible they may be, found they cannot. Some may admire thee for them, none shall bless thee.

Upon these words he thus descants. 'These (*some*) may agree with the Church Art. 11. to think it a Doctrine full of comfort indeed, that we are justified by *faith only*. But to believe it also a *wholesome* Doctrine, there they leave her. Unless they can fetch themselves off with that new notion of faith, (they seem so fond of and so hot upon,) which helps to establish *Justification by Works*; even at the same time as they profess the Doctrine of the Church, that it is *only by faith*. And how is this, but the fine *Equivocation* of making *faith* and *works* to be *all one*; and taking faith only for *faithfulness*, or sincere obedience? Nay a certain Clergyman (of strange confidence and seeming ignorance of his own Churchs Doctrine,) in a *folio* dedicated to his *Metropolitan* (in the late K. Charles his reign,) defines the justifying faith which S. Paul speaks so much of, to be nothing but the *Christian Religion*: and justification by faith, nothing but an *adhering to, and practice of the Christian religion*. And after him, a greater man, and much more wise and modest, yet calls this faith, our *observation of the laws of Christ*; and the entire condition of the new Covenant, comprehending all the duty which it requires. And this seems to be the prevailing notion among all the writers of that new Stamp.

' Now

Now (saith he) do I bless God for the *Scriptures*, and particularly *S. Paul's Epistles*; from which I can easily gather up a Satisfying notion of *Justifying faith*; when these men, methinks lead us into a wood; as it they had a mind only to *darken* a plain matter, and *amuse* and lose the Reader. And while they confound *faith* with *works*, and make no difference between *believing* and *obeying*; what do they but take away all distinction between the *cause* and the *effect*? ---- It is one thing, what the true *Justifying faith* is, and another thing, what it does *effect*, where it is. Now some that take pains to prove, that to be no *true faith*, which works not a *holy life*, do only tell you, what faith is not; to guard it from the abuses of rude pretenders: but they say nothing at all what it is, to the *establishment* of any true believers; as long as they conceal or deny, faith to be the *Soul's relying* and trusting on the merits and Satisfaction of Jesus Christ for pardon and Salvation: nay while they hold you in hand (by the drift of all their discourses on faith,) that right *believing* is nothing else but *holy living*; and that nothing else will ever *avail* to justification; i. e. (directly opposite to the Apostle,) that we are justified by *works*, and not by *faith*.

And here their assurance and swaggering grows to such an height; that they seem to carry all before them. And had we not better authority and stronger conviction, wherewith to confront their words and reasonings, we must even give up the cause; and own our silly mistake. But when we come to consult the *Scriptures*; the unanimous *Confessions* of the reformed; the positive *determinations* of our own Church; the *consciences* of the best men; and the *experiences* of all true believers in the world: then we cannot but stand amazed at the Audacity of some Church-men, and Protestant writers, that they should so coarsely use their own Church and so fiercely let fly at the Protestant Religion. And from such I shall not be much startled to hear *Antinomian*: which I know they can throw as a hard word, at the heads of some that least deserve it: when

when really the mad rage is at another thing, that
 'sounds, like it, (*Anti-arminian*;) this is meant, tho'
 'less named, because the other sounds more *Invidious*.
 See the *Preface to Mr. Jenks Submission to the righteousness of God*, a good useful book, well explaining the
Doctrine of the Church of England, in her *Articles and Homilies*, as to this point, *Justification by faith only*.

I might also mention Mr. Troughton who expressly
 chargeth Mr. B. as I do, with making *faith and obedi-*
ence (in the sense explained,) to be *one*. See his *Latb.*
Red. part 2. p. 156. where he speaks thus. ' The So-
 ' cinians affirm faith and obedience to be really the *same*
 ' thing, distinct only formally or *docendi causa*, *Doc.*
 ' resp. ad Epist. Joan. *Opera & fides nullo modo distin-*
 ' *guuntur à Paulo, nec ab eâ Separari queant, Imò anima*
 ' *scilicet forma fidei sunt.* The *Arminians* agree with them
 ' in this; and our late Author's with them both; and
 ' make believing and obeying the Gospel all one: and to
 ' be justified by faith with them is to be justified by *obedi-*
 ' *ence* to the Gospel. Hence it is that they describe faith
 ' to be, so to believe God, as to love him, fear him, trust
 ' him, and obey him in every particular command. *Aphor.*
 ' *Th. 70. &c.*

And what does Mr. B. say less in his other writings,
 where he makes *Christianity* and *justifying faith* to be
 the same thing? Accordingly he tells us in his *sence of*
the 39 Articles, which he published about the time that
 the act of liberty came forth; particularly in his *ex-*
position of the 11th. Article that Christianity is that faith,
which Paul opposeth unto works. But of this more under
 the next charge.

Secondly, he accuserh me, as misrepresenting Mr. B.
 because I say, that he pleads for justification, (particular-
 ly in his *Aphorisms* and other places) by faith it self, not
 relatively and instrumentally considered; understanding by
 faith, obedience to the whole Gospel; making no distinc-
 tion between faith and Gospel works. This charge we
 have, p. 14.

That

R E P L Y

That Mr. B. pleads for Justification by faith *it self*, as an act of obedience; and not by faith *Relatively* and *Instrumentally* considered, whereby we understand the *righteousness of Christ apprehended by faith*, is apparent to any that are acquainted with his writings. I shall quote some places.

The first book I shall turn to, shall be his *Aphorisms of Justification*, because this was mentioned in my *Disputation*, and for which my *Opponent* does severely check me, expressing himself on this occasion after this manner; p. 17. 'We cannot but reflect upon it as a most *unworthy* and *disingenuous* thing in our Author to send us to Mr. B's. *Aphorisms* to understand his judgment in the case before us, and not to his later writings, in as much as that was the *first* book he wrote, and long since *suspended* by him for some *uncautelous* expressions in it. But he is as unhappy here, in referring us to Mr. B's. *Aphorisms*, as he was before in referring us to his Book of *Redemption*, &c.

How *unhappy* I was in my former quotation the *Reader* has already seen. And whether I am *unhappy* in this will soon appear by particular *Quotations*, when first I have wiped off that *Scurrilous* reflection, thrown on me for *mentioning* this book.

That Mr. B. *Suspended* this book because it *offended* many of his *Brethren*, who thought he undermined the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness, and therefore *employed* their pens against him, particularly Dr. Kendal, Dr. Tully, Dr. Owen, Mr. Lyford, Mr. Burges, Mr. Troughton, Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Crandon, Mr. Warner, Mr. Blake, and many others, is sufficiently manifest. But 'tis not so evident, that Mr. B. *Changed* his judgment, because we find the *same* Doctrine for *Substance* in his other writings. Yea he himself in his later writings does acknowledge the Doctrine contained in his *Aphorisms* for *Substance* to be sound; particularly, in his *Treatise of Justifying* right. p. 22. Where he speaks thus. 'I wrote

‘ a small book called *Aphorisms* of Justification, which
‘ contained that Doctrine in *Substance*, which I judge
‘ sound; but being the first that I wrote, it had several
‘ expressions in it, which needed *Correction*, which made
‘ me *suspend* or retract it, till I had some time to re-
‘ form it.

Now this considered that Mr. B. himself in his *later* writings does acknowledge his Doctrine contained in his *Aphorisms* to be sound for *Substance*, one might think a quotation from this book, and that only in the general, should not deserve so severe a Reflection, (as a most unworthy and disingenuous thing;) but this Author abounds with such language, on far less occasions; it is his infirmity, and we must bear with him.

But I am unhappy (as saith this Author) in quoting this book, for he insinuates because I quoted no particular Page, that Mr. B's. *Aphorisms* do rather confute, than confirm what I say.

As for quoting the particular page, it was not my design in my *Disputation* to take particular notice of any book of Mr. B's. save his book of *Redemption*. But yet was ready on any just call, to produce the place I referred to in general, and now shall answer this Author's summons. He intimates that there is nothing in the book to my purpose. Whether this be so or no, let the following quotations be considered.

Aphorisms of Justif. p. 66. Thesis 17. Therefore as there are two Covenants with their distinct conditions: so is there a twofold righteousness, and both of them absolutely necessary to Salvation. And in the explication of this Thesis, he speaks thus; I take it for granted, that he must have a twofold righteousness, answerable to the two Covenants, that expecteth to be justified. And the usual confounding of these two distinct righteousnesses, doth much darken the controversies about Justification. Thesis 18. Our Legal righteousness or righteousness of the first Covenant is not personal, but is wholly without us in Christ. Thesis 19. The righteousness of the new Covenant is the only condition of our Interest in, and enjoyment of the righteousness of the old. Thesis 20. Our Evangelical righte-
ousness

ness is not without us in Christ, as our Legal Righteousness is: but consisteth in our own actions of Faith and Gospel obedience. Thesis 23. In this sense it is so far from being an Error to affirm, (that faith it self is our righteousness) that it is a truth necessary for every Christian to know, that Faith is our Evangelical righteousness, as Christ is our Legal righteousness. Thesis 56. Where speaking of the causes of Justification, he makes faith to be a *causa sine qua non*, and disputes against the Instrumentality of it, in his Expl. of this Thesis. His words are these. Perhaps I shall be blamed as singular from all men, in denying faith to be the Instrument of our Justification: but affectation of singularity leads me not to it. 1. If faith be an Instrument, it is the Instrument of God or man, &c. And so he goes on, disputing against the Instrumentality of it.

Thesis 70. Faith in the largest sense as it comprehendeth all the Conditions of the new Covenant, may be thus defined; It is when a sinner by the Word and Spirit of Christ being thoroughly convinced, &c. doth hereupon believe the truth of the Gospel, and accept of Christ as his only Lord and Saviour, to bring them to God their chiefest good, and to present them pardoned and just before him, and to bestow upon them a glorious inheritance, and do accordingly rest on him as their Saviour, and sincerely (though imperfectly) obey him as their Lord, forgiving others, loving his people, bearing what sufferings are imposed, diligently using his means and ordinances, and Confessing and bewailing their sins against him, and praying for pardon, and all this sincerely unto the end. (And by the way, what is this, but by faith to understand obedience to the whole Gospel?) Thesis 72. As the accepting of Christ for Lord (which is the hearts Subjection) is as Essential a part of justifying faith, as the accepting of him for our Saviour: so Consequently, sincere obedience (which is the effect of the former) hath as much to do in justifying us before God, as Affiance, (which is the fruit of the latter.) Thesis 73. From what hath been said, it appeareth in what sense faith only justifies; and in what sense works also justify: viz. 1. Faith only justifieth, as it implieth and includeth all o-

ther parts of the condition of the new Covenant: and is so put in opposition to the works of the law, or the personal righteousness of the old Covenant. 2. Faith only justifieth, as the great principal master Duty of the Gospel, or chief part of its condition, to which all the rest are some way reducible. 3. Faith only doth not justify in opposition to the works of the Gospel; but those works, do also justify, as the Secondary, less principal parts of the condition of the Covenant. Thesis 74. So that they both justify in the same kind of causality, viz. as *causæ sine quibus non*, or *mediæ* and improper causes, &c. Ex. 1. I know this is the Doctrine that will have the loudest out-cries raised against it: and will make some cry out, Heresy, Popery, Socinianism! and what not?

Now judge, Reader, whether I am so very unhappy in referring to this book, as my Opponent would make us believe. Mr. B. in this book does tell us in *terminis*, that faith it self is our Evangelical (justifying) righteousness, he opposeth it to faith *Instrumentally* considered, and faith, it justifies in the same kind of causality, as Gospel works do, and tells us expressly that sincere obedience has as much to do in justifying us before God, as *affiance*: and if so, then according to him, faith and obedience in this business are the same thing; only he gives one a priority of order above the other; faith, (which he faith is our first consent to Christianity, or the Gospel Covenant,) is our *first* obedience, and our actual performing the terms of the Covenant, as called to it, is our *after* obedience. And so Mr. B. doth no distinguish between Faith and Gospel-works, so as to oppose them, one to the other, in this business of justification. He makes them *Subordinate*, and faith expressly, that faith only does not justify in opposition to Gospel works, to which notwithstanding the Apostle doth oppose it, Eph. 2. 8, 9. And thus according to this Doctrine, we have no Evangelical justifying righteousness but our own righteousness; our faith, (or first consent to the Gospel Covenant,) and our after-obedience. And thus we establish our own righteousness in justification, the great fault for which the Jews were blamed, Ro. 9. 32, 33. Ro. 10. 3.

As to what Mr. B. saith, of Christ's being our *Legal Righteousness*, and of a *double justification* at the bar of the law and the bar of the Gospel, upon the account of a *twofold righteousness* answerable to the two Covenants, which he calls our *Legal* and *Evangelical* righteousness, I must profess I do not understand it, neither do I conceive the *distinction* to be sound. For as I apprehend it, we are justified only at the bar of the Gospel; for 'tis impossible since the fall to have justification at the bar of the Law, Ro. 8. 3. It is either wholly of *works*, or wholly of *grace*: 'tis not by both or by a mixture, as the Apostle sheweth, Ro. 11. 6. In order to be justified at the bar of the Law we must have a *Personal* perfect righteousness. The Law threatens a curse to all, that do not perform in their *own persons*, Gal. 3. 10. The first Covenant admits of no *Surety*. The admitting of a Surety to obey and die in our place, to fulfil that *righteousness* that was our Duty, and bear the *curse* that was our due, that we might go free upon our complying with Gospel terms, is what we call the *Covenant of Grace*. That *another's righteousness* is accepted for, and reckoned to us upon our believing; we count this the very *heart* of the Gospel. And therefore we say, that *Christ's righteousness* imputed to us, and our *faith* or consenting to the Gospel Covenant, in order to be interested in this righteousness, do both fall under *Evangelical* righteousness; and our Justification thereupon, both by the one and the other, is at the bar of the Gospel: and therefore we deny the above distinction of that *double righteousness* and *justification*, as explained by Mr. B. as having no solid *Scripture foundation*.

I confess that Mr. B. in some of his writings does seem to wave the term *Legal*, and does rather chuse to call Christ's righteousness, our *Prolegal* righteousness: but what advantage this brings to the cause, as explained by him, I see not. For if by *Prolegal* he means that 'tis instead of the righteousness of the Law, (of that perfect righteousness which the Law of Innocency required,) then I cannot reconcile it with some other passages in some other of his books, particularly his *end of Doctri-*

nal Controversies, p. 276. Where he tells us, that our *Evangelical personal righteousness* is all that is required on our part instead of all that perfect obedience, which the *Law of Innocency* required. And if so, then our faith and personal righteousness may be properly called our *Prolegal* righteousness, as well as Christ's righteousness. And thus we shall confound Mr. B's. distinction of a *Prolegal* and *Evangelical* righteousness.

Besides, according to Mr. B's. Doctrine, who allows not Christ to be a *Legal Representative*, nor to suffer by virtue of our *violated Law*, (tho the Scripture tells us, he was made *under the Law*, Gal. 4. 4.) I do not see how Christ's righteousness can be said to be our *Legal* or *Prolegal* righteousness. For this Supposeth that Christ fulfilled the Law of works as our *Representative*, and also implieth some proper *Imputation*. For how Christ's righteousness should be *ours*, (our *Legal* or *Prolegal* righteousness,) when 'twas not in conformity to our Law, as our *Representative*, and when 'tis not *Imputed* to us; is somewhat hard to imagine. Ours it is not by *Inbession*; we did not Personally fulfil it: and how it can be ours by *Imputation*, if we deny Christ to be a *Representative*, in the acts of it, I do not understand. And therefore methinks this *new way* of explaining matters does not put things in a *better light*, than we had before.

I suppose by this time my *Opponent* sees; that he had no reason to reflect on me, as *Unhappy*, for referring to this book. And if he now says, that this book was *Suspended* by Mr. B. for some *uncautelous* expressions, (whereas Mr. B. himself tells us by a *late* acknowledgment, that he judged the Doctrine contained in this book for *substance* sound, which therefore made me take this *liberty* to pass a few *Reflections* on it,) yet what I say in my *Disput.* that Mr. B. pleads for Justification by *Inherent* righteousness, or by *faith it self* as an act of obedience, and not *Relatively* and *Instrumentally* considered; and so, in this sense, makes no distinction between *Faith* and *Gospel works*, may be evinced from his other *late* writings, some of which I shall now quote.

We

We have for substance all that I have quoted from Mr. B's. *Aphorisms*, in his *four Disputations about Justification*. For there also we have the distinction of a *double Justification*, and a *double constitutive justifying righteousness*, *Legal* and *Evangelical*; which I shall only transcribe without any remark, having already given my thoughts of it. His words are these; p. 106. ' Besides all this, I must distinguish of *Justification*, *Legal* and *Evangelical*, respective to the promises and threatnings of the Law and Gospel, which do differ. No works at all did justify *Abraham*, from the charge of the law, ' *Thou art a sinner*, as being the righteousness of the Law, ' and the matter of that Justification. Nor will any ' works at all so justify us. But it doth not follow that ' therefore no works will justify a man from the false accusation of being an *Impenitent unbeliever*, and so having no part in Christ, whose righteousness must stop the mouth of the Law: Or that no works are the matter of the righteousness required in this constitution, ' [He that believeth shall be saved: Repent that your sins may be blotted out.] &c.

So, p. 216. ' I say that the performance of these conditions (speaking of Gospel conditions,) is our *Evangelical righteousness* (in reference to that Covenant,) as Christ's Satisfaction is our *Legal Righteousness*, (in reference to that first Covenant,) or as perfect obedience would have been our *Legal righteousness*, if we had so obeyed.

Here also he confirms what he had said in his *Aphorisms* at Th. 72. That we are justified by *Obedience* as well as *faith*. For in this book likewise, he makes *faith*, as *Justifying*, to respect Christ as *King* as well as *Priest*. His words are these, p. 210. ' This being therefore fully proved, that *faith* justifieth properly and directly ' as the condition; on which God hath made over Christ, ' and all his benefits in the Gospel, the two great points ' opposed in my Doctrine do hence arise unavoidably. ' 1. That this *faith* justifieth as truly and directly, as it ' is the receiving of Christ for Lord and King, and ' head and husband, as for a Justifier, for both are equal-

by the conditions of the Gospel, &c. 2. And hence it follows, that Repentance, forgiving others, love to Christ, Obedience Evangelical, do so far justify, as the Gospel promise makes them conditions.

To prevent mistakes, we do not deny, that Repentance, forgiving others, love to Christ, Evangelical obedience, &c. are in some sense conditions of Justification. They are *Remote Dispositive Conditions*, and thereby we are *declaratively* justified, these being good evidences of a living faith; they are necessary *qualifications* of the person to be justified, and conditions *sine quibus non*, as being the genuine fruits and constant attendants of true faith: but then we do not make them to be *equal conditions* of Justification with faith, which is the *immediate receptive condition*; neither do we ascribe to them the same *efficiency* in this business as we do to faith, which alone has that office assigned it by God, and that *aptitude* in its own nature, to receive the *Atonement*, and the *gift of righteousness*, Ro. 5. 11, 17. to empty a man of his self-sufficiency, and to make him go out of himself to Christ, to rely and depend on his *righteousness*, and the promise of God made to us through him. And therefore tho we say, that *justifying faith* receives Christ in all his offices, for Lord and teacher, as well as Priest, and that which doth not is not justifying: yet when we speak of Justifying faith, with this reduplication, as *justifying*; to we say, that it respects Christ only as Priest, as making atonement, and fulfilling the law for us. And hence we are said to be *justified by Christ's blood*, and *through faith in his blood*, Ro. 3. 25. ch. 5. 9. and to be made *righteous to Justification through his obedience*, Ro. 5. 18, 19.

Though a whole Christ must be received by us in all his offices, Joh. 1. 12. and therefore we must take him for Prince as well as Saviour, as God offers him, Act. 3. 11. yet in some of Christ's offices he was not so much our *Representative*, as he was Gods: in his *Prophetical* and *kingly* office he did in a sort represent God, and came to us in his Fathers name, and acted from God toward us. Now our faith, (as I humbly conceive,) as it is *justifying*,

ing, respects Christ chiefly in those parts of his office, wherein he acted as our *Representative*, in fulfilling the righteousness of the Law for us, and offering up himself a Sacrifice on the Cross, which he did considered as *Priest*.

And therefore as we distinguish of faith, *a parte Subjecti*, in respect of its subject; and say that 'tis faith alone that justifies, but not that faith, which is alone. And as we distinguish *a parte actus*, in respect of its act; and say, that it is not faith in its absolute consideration, as a work, that justifies, for so it could no more justify than any other work, yea rather less: but only as 'tis a *receiving grace and relates to Christ's Righteousness*. So I see no reason, why we may not also distinguish of faith *a parte objecti*, upon the account of its object, what it is in Christ, that faith takes in for Justification: and so we say, that tho Justifying faith doth receive Christ as Prophet, Priest and King; yet as justifying, it respects Christ chiefly, if not only as Priest, as fulfilling the law for us, and offering up himself a Sacrifice for us, and thereby meriting Pardon and Heaven for us. And therefore in this business of Justification, we usually distinguish between *fides qua* & *fides quæ*. Which distinction is strenuously opposed by Mr. B in his 3d. *Disput.* against Mr. Warner, p. 294, 308, &c. And therefore in this Mr. B. differs from the common Doctrine. And it is observable, of those that deny this distinction, that they commonly teach Justification by obedience as well as faith. But to pass to some other things.

In this book (*viz. his 4. Disput. &c.*) Mr. B. also denies the *Instrumentality* of faith, and so confirms what I say in my *Disputation*; that he pleads for Justification by faith is *self, not Relatively and Instrumentally considered*. He speaks against the *Instrumentality* of faith, in diverse places of this book, particularly in his *Preface* at Prop. 10. Also at, p. 29. and p. 212, 213, 214, &c. Where he disputes largely against it, saying that this Doctrine does make man the *causa proxima* of his own Pardon and Justification. For, (saith he,) it is man that believes and not God. And to the same purpose is that argument

argument in his *Aphorisms* against the *Instrumentality* of faith, at *Th.* 56. in the explication whereof he speaks thus; *If faith be an Instrument, it is the Instrument of God or man. Not of man: For man is not the principal efficient, he does not justify himself. &c.*

To prevent mistakes, it may not be amiss to shew in what sense we own faith to be an *Instrument* of Justification. The great reason, why we make use of this term, is to *establish* Christ's righteousness, and to empty man of all self fulness and self dependance; so far are we from making man by this Doctrine the *causa proxima* of his own pardon, and to be *faber sue justificationis*. Those that plead for the *conditionality* of faith, but reject the notion of its *Instrumentality*, (as far as I perceive) do generally fall in, with the *Arminian* Doctrine, of Justification by *faith it self*, as it is the fulfilling of the Gospel condition. Now to *establish* the righteousness of Christ, and our glorying in him as the *Lord our righteousness*, in whose righteousness we (with the Apostle) *desire to be found*, we maintain the Doctrine of faith's *Instrumentality* in Justification, as well as *conditionality*.

Perhaps the expression may not *quadratin* every particular: but we can't think of an *apt* term to express the Doctrine we hold by. For tho by this term we do in a sense ascribe *efficiency* unto faith; yet it is the *lowest* kind of efficiency; and in such a way, that there is nothing in this Doctrine that has any tendency to *exalt* man, as tho he does *effect* his own pardon. For we teach, according to the Scriptures, that faith is *God's gift*, Eph. 2. 8. And when we say that this faith is an *Instrumental cause* of our Justification we acknowledge it is only a *Metaphorical* term, in allusion to a person, that *puts forth his hand* to receive, or take a pardon tendred to him: and therefore it is common to call faith, the *hand of the Soul*, that apprehends Christ's righteousness, and lays hold on God's promise. Now as it cannot, with any *justice*, be affirmed, that a guilty Malefactor, that puts forth his hand to receive a pardon, written and sealed and tendred to him, that he does *effect*

fect his own pardon, tho his hand is the Instrument, or *Instrumental cause*, of receiving this pardon: so neither can it be said with any *justice*, that we *justify our selves*, and are the *principal efficient*s of our Justification, tho we make faith, as the hand of the soul, to be the *Instrument* of receiving our pardon, or the *Instrumental cause* of our Justification.

We must distinguish of *Justification*, which is two-fold, *Active* and *Passive*. *Active*, whereby God justifies us; and *Passive*, whereby we are justified. If we speak of *Active Justification*, whereby God justifies us, and gives us a pardon and right to life, so God is the *principal efficient*, and his Gospel is the *Instrument* of it. But if we speak of *Passive Justification*, whereby we are justified, and how this is brought about, so something must be done on our part, we must receive Christ, *Job. 1. 12.* We must receive the *Atonement*, and the *gift of righteousness*, *Ro. 5. 11, 17.* and this (as it were) by the hand of faith, in which respect faith may be called an *Instrumental cause*.

There is a great deal of difference between *giving* and *taking* a pardon. Faith is not the *Instrument* of the former, tho it may be of the latter. Faith is not God's *Instrument* in granting pardon, or conferring on us a right to Heaven, any farther than he is the *worker* of it in us: but, for ought I see, it may be aptly enough called *our Instrument*, in receiving pardon, it being, as it were, the *hand of the soul*, whereby we apprehend Christ's righteousness, and receive the Atonement, upon the account of which we came, according to the Gospel way and order, to be justified and pardoned.

Thus then this Doctrine may be maintained without making man his *own Justifier*, without *exalting* man in the least. Yea it tends effectually to prevent pride and boasting in man, seeing he is justified by the *gift of righteousness*, by another's righteousness, and not his own; his own being only of use to him, to give him an *Interest* in that righteousness, for which he is justified, and accepted as righteous.

I think some defence ought to be given to some other Divines, as well as Mr. B. and these generally do call *faith*, with reference to its use in justification, by the name of an *Instrument*.

The book of *Homilies* doth so call it. See *Hom. of Passion*, p. 187.

The *Westminster Assembly* in their Confession and Catechism, do give it this name. See their Conf. ch. 11. §. 2. and their larger Catech. Q. 73.

And our first Reformers, *Calvin*, *Luther*, &c. and many other eminent Divines do so term it.

Saith *Calvin*, *fides est Instrumentum percipiendæ justitiæ*. Inst. l. 3. c. 11. §. 7. *Fides* (saith *Luther*, loc. com. class. 2. loc. 19.) *justificat, quia apprehendit & possidet illius thesaurum, sc. Christum, &c.* And *Bellarmine* saying that *Luther* makes *faith* *formalem causam justificationis*, *Davenant* answers *Instrumentalem semper agnoscit, non autem formalem, &c.* De Just. habit. cap. 22.

Fides (saith *Rivet*) *est velut organum, & manus animæ, quæ beneficia oblata acceptantur*. Disp. de fide Justifi. § 17, 18. And § 19. *Fides non justificat, quatenus est opus justitiæ, sed quatenus apprehendit justitiæ Christi.*

Turretin speaking to that Q. *An fides nos justificet proprie & per se, an tantum Relative & Organice?* determines thus, *Prius negatur, Posterius affirmatur*. Contra Socin Remonst. & Pontit. Vol. 2. p. 731.

Saith *Watson* (de xrecon. p. 1. l. 2. c. 18.) *Ex efficientibus justificationis causis reliqua est fides, quam Instrumenti locum obtinere diximus.*

Saith *Bucan*, *Sola fides justificat, quia ipsa unicum est instrumentum, & unica facultas in nobis, qua recipimus justitiæ Christi*. Sic efficientis causa respectu solus *Dens* justificat, non *fides*: meritoria, sola obedientia filii justificat: at Instrumentalis respectu sola *fides*. Buc. loc. 31. ad Q. 37.

Saith Mr. *Perkins* (in his Comment on, Gal. 2. 16. p. 129.) 'Faith justifieth, because it is an *Instrument* to apprehend and apply that which justifieth, namely *Christ* and his obedience. As the *Israelites* sung of
'hery

fiery Serpents were cured, so are we saved, Joh. 3. 16. The Israelites did nothing at all, but only *look* upon the brazen Serpent; so are we to do nothing for our Justification and Salvation, but to fix the eye of our faith on Christ. The Bankrupt pays his debt by accepting the payment made by his surety. It is the property of true religion to *depress* nature, and to *exalt* grace: and this is done, when we make God the only worker of our Salvation, and make our selves to be no more but *receivers* of the mercy and grace of God by faith, and receivers not by nature but by grace, reaching out the *beggars hand*, namely our faith in Christ, to receive the gift or alms of mercy.

Bishop Usher, in his *body of Divinity*, p. 196. speaking to that Quest. *How is this great benefit of Justification applied by us, and apprehended by us?* Saith he, This is done on our part by *faith alone*, and that not considered as a *virtue* inherent in us, working by love, but only as an *Instrument*, or hand of the Soul, stretched forth to lay hold on the Lord our *righteousness*, Ro. 5. 1. and 10. 10. Jer. 23. 6. So that faith justifies only *Relatively*, in respect of the object which it fasteneth on, *sc. the righteousness of Christ*, by which we are justified, faith being only the *Instrument* to convey so great a benefit unto the Soul, as the hand of the beggar receives the alms.

Dr. Preston in his *Treatise of faith*, p. 58. speaking to this Q. *How doth faith justify?* Saith he, 'For this know that faith is considered two ways, either as it *works* or as it *receives*; either as a *quality* or as an *Instrument*. As a *quality* it works, and in this sence it hath nothing to do with Justification. It justifies us as it is an *Instrument*, &c.

Saith Mr. Pemble; 'Faith doth justify *Relatively* and *Instrumentally*, &c. Again, we deny that faith justifieth as it is a *work*, &c. it justifies us only as the *condition* required of us, and an *Instrument* of embracing Christ's righteousness, &c. *Pemb. of Justif. ch. 1. p. 17. and ch. 3. p. 61.*

Saith Mr. Blake, 'Faith as an *Instrument* receives righteousness unto Justification, &c. Again, those things considered I am truly sorry that *faith* should now be denied to have the office and place of an *Instrument* in Justification, &c. Of the Covenant, ch. 12. p. 80, 82.

Saith Mr. Cartwright (in his *Exceptions against Mr. B.* &c. p. 14.) 'Faith as a *work* is excluded from Justification, only it justifieth as an *Instrument* or hand receiving Christ and his righteousness.

Saith Mr. Troughton in his *Luth. Red.* part 2. p. 161. 'All that Divines mean by saying faith justifies as an *Instrument* or *Instrumentally*, is, that man is justified by the *righteousness of Christ*, which Justification is proposed and promised in the Gospel to all that will accept it, and trust in it, which is believing. So that *faith it self* is not the matter or righteousness which doth justify us under the Gospel, instead of our Obedience under the Law; but it is the *means* whereby through the promise of the Gospel *Christ's righteousness is imputed* or applied to us, by and for which we are justified.

And then mentioning Mr. B's. objection, viz. *If faith justify as an Instrument whose Instrument is it, God's or mans, &c.* he gives a particular answer to it, p. 162.

It were easy to mention many other Eminent Divines, who call faith by the name of an *Instrument*, let one more suffice for all.

Saith Dr. Owen in his *Treat. of Justif.* ch. 3. p. 147. 'Protestant Divines until of late have unanimously affirmed faith to be the *Instrumental cause* of our Justification. So it is exprest to be in many of the *Publick Confessions* of their Churches. This notion of theirs concerning the nature and use of *faith* was from the first opposed by those of the *Roman Church*; afterwards it was denied also by the *Socinians*, as either false or improper; and of late this expression is disliked by some among our selves, &c.

Now surely these *Divines* understood what they spake, as well as Mr. B. and all know, that they were far from

from making man his own Justifier, notwithstanding they call faith an *Instrumental cause*. Yea, they ascribed this notion to faith, on purpose to prevent all boasting in man, and to shew that we are justified by another's righteousness, (i.e. Christ's righteousness,) and not our own; for nothing doth so clearly establish the Doctrine of the *Imputation of Christ's righteousness* as this doth. Whereas those that reject this expression, of faith's being an *Instrument*, and do say only that it is a *condition*, or a *causa sine qua non* of our Justification, do generally establish (for ought I see) *their own righteousness* in Justification, and so do more justly fall under their own Censure. For as Dr. Owen has well noted,

‘ After they have given the specious name of a *condition*,
 ‘ and a *causa sine qua non*, unto faith, they immediately
 ‘ take all other graces and works of obedience into the
 ‘ same state with it, and the same use in Justification.
 ‘ And after this seeming Gold hath been cast for a while
 ‘ into the fire of Disputation, there comes out a *Calf* of
 ‘ a *Personal inherent righteousness*, whereby men are justified
 ‘ before God, *virtute fœderis Evangelici*; for as
 ‘ for the righteousness of Christ to be imputed to us, it is
 ‘ gone into Heaven, and they know not what is become
 ‘ of it. See Dr. Ow. of Just. p. 144. But not to insist
 any longer on this.

Another thing that I shall remark in these *Disputations*, before I pass from them, is this; that Mr. B. in these *Disput.* does make justifying faith, as justifying, to be Christianity at large, or Christianity in consent; making this difference between faith and obedience; one is our Purpose, or Covenanting, or consenting to obey Christ *de futuro*; the other is our performance of what we purpose, Covenant or consent to. His words are these. Speaking of faith, p. 15, faith he, It is the same with our becoming Christians. And, p. 97. he speaks thus, I make faith to be but the Covenanting, and obedience the performance of what we consented to. And to this purpose is what he saith, p. 389. But I tell you my mind. I take this purpose of obeying Christ *de futuro* to be very faith it self. For faith is a Covenant-Reception
of

of Christ, and to take him for Christ and King-Redeemer, and to purpse, yea Covenant to obey him, are but one thing.

So that in a sence, *faith* is but our *first obedience*, (for our purpose, consenting, or Covenanting to obey, as it is our *Duty*, is an act of obedience) and our *performing* what by *faith* we purpose, Covenant or consent to, is our *after obedience*. And accordingly Mr. B. does not oppose *faith*, in this business of *Justification*, unto *Gospel works*, but only to *Legal* and *Mosaical ones*; and therefore in reconciling S. Paul and S. James, he tells us, that S. James speaks of *Gospel works*, S. Paul of *Legal*, &c. See his *Disput.* p. 102, 119. And so according to Mr. B. we may be justified, and that *constitutively*, by *Gospel works*; tho not by *Mosaical* and *Legal* ones. And therefore, I think, that I do not abuse Mr. B. in my *Disputation*, when I say, that in this respect, he makes no distinction between *Faith* and *Gospel works*, whereas the *Scripture* does distinguish, Eph. 2. 8, 9. Thus much for his *Four Disputations*, &c.

The next book I shall turn to shall be Mr. B's. *Confession of Faith*, in which likewise we have for *Substance*, the same things that I have already quoted from his *Disputations* and *Aphorisms*. Now know, Reader, that Mr. B's. *Confession of Faith* is that book, which he recommends to the world, as the true *Explication* of the *Doctrine* in his *Aphorisms*; and of which he speaks thus. *Because my Aphorisms had provoked so many, and the noise was very loud against them, to make the Passages plainer which offended them, (about Justification, Sanctification, Merit, Punishment, &c.) I wrote a book called (the Confession of my faith,) about those matters, which I gave the world, to save any more of them from misunderstanding my Aphorisms, &c.* See Mr. Baxter's life, p. 111. A quotation then from this book cannot be accounted a most unworthy and *disingenuous thing*; and yet we shall find in this book, the *Substance* of all I have quoted from his *Aphorisms*. For here also we have the distinction of a *double Justification*, and a *double constitutive* justifying righteouness, (*Legal* or *Prolegal* and

Evangelical

Evangelical;) here also, faith and Repentance and Gospel obedience have the *same kind of causality* in Justification, and the *Instrumentality* of faith is denied; here also, he makes faith and obedience in a *sence one*, and does not oppose faith in this business of Justification *unto Gospel works*: and what is all this, but to confirm what I say in my *Disputation*? But to come to particular quotations.

In this book we have the Distinction of a double *Constitutive Justification*, (at the bar of the Law and the bar of the Gospel,) and this according to a double *Constitutive* justifying righteousness, *Legal* or *Prolegal* and *Evangelical*. For, p. 56, 57. he speaks thus. *Whoever will be justified at the day of judgment must have a Justitia Prolegalis or a righteousness of Remission of Sin through the blood of Christ, to plead against the Law, and also a personal Evangelical righteousness, consisting in a performance of the Conditions of the Gospel or new Covenant, which is the condition of our Interest in the first; or else he cannot be justified, &c.* Seeing this twofold righteousness is necessary to our Justification in judgment, therefore it must needs follow that it is necessary to the making us righteous, or our (Constitutive) Justification in this life, in the order before laid down. See more to this purpose, p. 52. Which place I shall leave the Reader to consult, and only make this remark upon both, to prevent mistakes.

We do not deny the necessity of a twofold righteousness to Justification, namely Christ's righteousness and our own; but we deny it according to Mr. B's. explication, viz. that both are necessary, *quoad efficientiam*, to Justification *Constitutively* considered, or that there is a double *Constitutive Justification*, at the bar of the Law and the bar of the Gospel; supposing that since the fall, there is no Justification but at the bar of the Gospel only; at which bar we are justified *Constitutively* by faith only, as it apprehends Christ's righteousness; tho we are justified *Declaratively* at the same bar by works also, and this according to Turretine's explication, Vol. 2. p. 745.

Again, In Mr. B's. *Confession of Faith*; we find that Faith, Repentance and Gospel obedience have the same kind of causality in Justification, being only *causa sine quibus non*, or dispositive conditions, and the Instrumentality of Faith is denied. At p. 56. we have these words, *The sum of my Doctrine I contrail into these heads.* 1. *That faith justifieth not as an Instrumental efficient cause, but as Condicio applicans & disponens, the applying and disposing condition.* 2. *That Repentance is conditio disponens, a Dispositive condition of our first Justification.* 3. *That Covenant-keeping by sincere love, thankfulness and obedience to God our Redeemer is a condition of the continuing, or not losing our state of Justification.* 4. *That the renewal of our Faith and Repentance upon our Relapses into discerned, wounding sin, is a condition of the particular Pardon of those sins, and our discharge or Justification from the guilt of them.* 5. *That all the foresaid conditions, Faith, Repentance, Love, Thankfulness, Sincere Obedience, together with Final perseverance do make up the condition of our final absolution in judgment, and our Eternal Glorification.*

I quote all this, not that I deny, that Repentance, and sincere obedience and perseverance are Gospel Conditions, or dispositive conditions of justification. We own them to be necessary in their place, to be necessary Qualifications and dispositions in the Subject, in the person to be justified, to be *conditio personae*; tho we make faith only, as apprehending Christ's righteousness, be *conditio rei*, that to which the promise of Justification is directly made, that so it might be of grace, as the Apostle argues, *Rom. 4. 16.* and not of works, *Eph. 2. 9.* And agreeable hereto is that distinction of Turretine, Vol. 2. p. 739. *Non negatur coexistentia charitatis cum fide in eo qui justificatur, sed coefficientia vel cooperatio in justificatione, i. e. We do not deny the Coexistence of charity with Faith; (and so of good works, when there is opportunity of performance,) in the person that is to be justified: but we deny their coefficient or cooperation in justification.* They do not justify in the same kind of causality. So p. 742. *Aliud est charitatem & opera requiri*

quæ in persona quæ justificatur, quod concedimus; aliud
 in actu ipso sive causalitate justificationis, quod negamus.
 So. p. 745. Aliud est opera cum fide connecti in persona
 justificati: aliud vero in negotio justificationis. Prius
 agnoscimus et probamus summum postea, quum de necessitate
 humanæ operum agitur: sed posterius negamus cum
 Paul. immo plane asserimus esse cum fide stativimus. i. e.
 It is one thing for good works to be joyned with faith in the
 person, that is justified; and another to be joyned with it in
 the business of Justification. The former we acknowledge,
 and shall prove hereafter, when we treat of the necessity of
 good works: but the latter we deny with St. Paul, &c.
 conclude that they are altogether inconsistent with faith in
 this business. So that faith and works according to Tur-
 retine have not the same use, the same kind of causality
 in Justification. He allows good works to have a place
 of a necessary Qualification, and dispositive condition;
 but he ascribes an efficiency to faith, and therefore pleads
 for the Instrumentality of it. Whereas Mr. B. does re-
 ject this notion of Faith's being an Instrument in many
 places, and particularly in his Confes. of Faith, p. 56, 88,
 95, 304, &c. And so pleads for Justification by the 7d
 credere, as 'tis our act, put forth in conformity to the
 Gospel Covenant: whereas according to Turretine, Vol.
 2. p. 711. this is properly the Arminian Doctrine.

Again, Mr. B. in his Confes. of Faith. does (in the
 sense I charge him with it) make faith and obedience to
 be all one; and so makes no opposite distinction in this
 business of Justification between Faith and Gospel works.
 Page 38, 39. Saith he, The very nature of Saving faith
 is to be a Heart-Covenant of a sinner with Christ as a
 Saviour, even as is a Covenant of a woman to her Hus-
 band, a Soldier to his Commander, a Subject to his prince,
 a Scholar to his master; it is our becoming his disciple.
 This Covenant containeth an engagement to future obe-
 dience: So that though our first faith be not the same thing
 with obedience to Christ, (at least it's distinct from all o-
 ther following obedience,) yet in taking Christ for King it
 essentially containeth a Resolution and Covenant to obey him.
 Tho' Repentance being a condition of the promise of Pardon

hath the same formal interest for kind in our Pardon as faith, yet in that they are made conditions upon several grounds, and from very different reasons in the nature of the acts, therefore there is a great difference to be put between one and the other in this business, &c. Page 40. Tho when the Question is, why faith or Repentance have such an interest in our Pardon, we give the same answer, *de ratione formalis*, because God hath made them the conditions of his Promise; yet we give not the same reason, *à natura & aptitudine actus*; but very different, as is declared.

Tho Mr. B. makes Faith and Repentance to justify differently with respect to their proper and particular acts, for Faith and Repentance strictly taken are two distinct graces; by one we believe the Promise of Pardon, by the other we consent to return unto God: yet the formal reason why they justify is the same in both; because God hath made them the Conditions of his promise, under which notion they both justify, according to Mr. B. as acts of obedience; and so in the sense I charge him with it, he makes faith and obedience to be one. Yea he does implicitly acknowledge so much in that fore-quoted sentence, *viz.* (So that though our first faith be not the same thing with obedience to Christ, at least it is distinct from all other following obedience, &c.) Here he plainly intimates, that faith in its nature, and as it justifies, is an act of obedience, tho it is distinct from other acts of obedience; q. d. that one act of obedience is distinct from another, after-acts from the former. It must be acknowledged they are Numerically distinct, and so faith is not the same with obedience: but if we consider it in its general nature, and as it justifies; so he makes no difference between them; both of them are acts of obedience, and as such (being made conditions of the new Covenant) both justify.

Accordingly Mr. B. does not oppose faith to Gospel works. For as in his Aphorisms, explaining how we are justified by faith only, he tells us, at Thesis 73, 74. that faith only doth not justify in opposition to the works of the Gospel, but those works do also justify; and they both justify

stifie in the same kind of causality, viz. as *cause sine qua non*: so in his Confession he has the same Doctrine. Indeed he tells us in some places that faith does not justify as a work, p. 30. Where he speaks thus, *Faith it self does not merit our Pardon or Justification, nor justify us as a work, &c.* Here again he makes use of our way of speaking, as before we observed concerning the Imputation of Christ's righteousness: but he does not mean by it the same thing, as is plain from his own explication in the following Pages. Particularly, p. 95. Where he tells us, that it does not justify *quâ opus*, as a work is taken for mercenary or meritorious working, as a workman doth for his wages, as Paul means. But then he denies not, but that it justifies as a Gospel work, and tells us that St. Paul does not exclude it in this sense from being the condition of Justification. His words are these. p. 66. *There is great ambiguity in the term works.* 1. By works may be meant in general any good action. Or 2. More especially such actions as a workman doth for his wages, making it debt, for the benefit that may redound thereby to another by way of commutative justice. 3. Or else for Perfect obedience according to the Law of nature as made to perfect man in innocency. 4. Or for doing the task of Services in Moses's Law, in themselves considered, &c. Or, 5. For sincere obedience to the Lord that bought us, according to the Gracious terms of the Gospel. Or, 6. For the External part of this obedience, distinct from love, trust, &c. Concerning this I lay down these propositions.

1. Paul never took works in the first sense, so as to exclude them from being conditions of Justification: for then he should have excluded Faith and Repentance. 2. Nor did he so take them in the 5th. or 6th. Sense, excluding them from being conditions of our final Justification. 3. James took not works in the same sense as Paul: for the works that James speaks of were necessary, but the works that Paul mentions might not be attempted or imagined, which make the reward to be not of Grace but of debt, and the works of the Jewish Ceremonies cease.

From this explication we learn this, that *Faith* as it justifies is not opposed by Mr. B. to *Gospel Works* tho it is to *Legal* and *Mosaical* ones.

So p. 88. he speaks thus. 1. I have ever hold, and do hold, that as our first believing, we are actually and absolutely justified from all our sins without exception, by *Faith in Christ*, without the *Works of the Law*, or without *Works in Paul's sense*. 2. I have ever hold that *Faith* it self, as a *Work in Paul's sense*, hath no hand in our *Justification*, nor *Salvation*; much less is it the cause thereof, *quod opus, afficit a Work*.

And if we would know what he means by *Paul's sense*, he explains himself again, p. 94. in these words; I think that the Jews conceit was, that God's Law delivered by Moses was so perfect and excellent, that the doing of the works therein prescribed, in a Laborious task of Ceremonial observances, did by the dignity and value of the work derived from the dignity of the Law, procure of it self the Pardon of all their sins, and their full acceptance with God, without any Sacrifice of a Mediator; and that this is it that Paul disputeth against, &c. I think therefore that by works Paul meaneth to exclude only Merits, or works that are conceived meritorious, or which for the worth of the deed done, should procure Pardon and acceptance with God, with out a Mediators blood, &c. I do not think therefore, that under the name, Works, Paul doth exclude the acts of Faith before mentioned, the love of Christ, or thankfulness for Grace, or the Confession of our great unworthiness, &c. I say these acts considered, not as falsely conceived meritorious, but as means of life, (and some of them to Justification at first,) and conditions without which God will not save us, were never excluded by Paul among works, &c.

From these Quotations it is very evident that Mr. Bin this business of Justification does not oppose *Faith* to *Gospel Works*, as our other Divines, that oppose the *Arminians*, usually do. And therefore in this sense, he makes no opposite *Distinction* between them, notwithstanding Scripture does oppose them.

And

And thus I think I have sufficiently vindicated what I say in my *Disputation*, not only from Mr. B's *Apo-
rismus*, and his *Disputations*, but from his *Confession*, which
is of later date, and which he himself recommends to
the world as a true explication of his *Apo-
rismus*, to save
persons from misunderstanding them. And tho now I
might justly be excused from more *Quotations* of this na-
ture, yet because we have such *plenty* of them, in Mr.
B's Writings, tho my *Opponent* notwithstanding all his
strict observation could not see them, I shall therefore to
help his observation refer him to two or three *Books*
more.

The next book, I shall tugg to, shall be Mr. B's *De-
bate with Mr. Cartwright*, intituled, *an account of his
considerations of the friendly, Modest, Learned Animad-
versions of Mr. Chr. Cartwright of York, on his Apo-
rismus*. And in this book, we have for Substance the
same things, that I have already observed in the forego-
ing *Quotations*. For here also we have the distinction
of a *double Justification*, at the bar of the Law, and the
bar of the Gospel, according to the *twofold Covenant* ;
and of a double Justifying righteousness, *Legal* and *Evangelical*. For, p. 93. he speaks thus:

' I should next hence shew you the necessity of a two-
' fold *Justification*. But it is so evident from what is
' said, that I will add but thus much. If there be a two-
' fold *Covenant* with distinct *conditions*, and a twofold
' *accusation*, viz. For not performing the one or the o-
' ther, then there must needs be a twofold *Justificati-
' on*. But, &c. Ergo, &c. To be accused as a *sinner*,
' that is (one that *did not continue in all things written
' in the Law to do them*), is not the same as to be accused
' to be (*an Unbeliever or Rejecter of Christ, &c.*) Must
' you not be justified against the former accusation by
' *Christ's blood directly*? And against the latter by your
' own *Innocency*? Will it serve to justify any man,
' when Satan accuseth him of *final unbelief or Impeni-
' tency*, to plead *Christ's Satisfaction, &c.*?

There also we have the distinction of a *double* consti-
tutive justifying righteousness. For Mr. Cartwright in

his *Animadversions*, p. 116. Speaking thus, *Faith is the condition, whereby we obtain Evangelical righteousness, which righteousness is indeed Christ's Satisfaction, only Faith is required of us, that this righteousness may be imputed to us.* Saith Mr. B. in Reply to it; 'Enough is said to this before. 1. *Christ's Satisfaction is strictly our Legal righteousness*, as you confessed; because it is a Satisfaction to the Law of Works, or to God as Legislator and Judge according to that Law: but accidentally it may be called our *Evangelical righteousness*, because the Gospel *revealeth and conferreth* it. 2. Faith is no part of this *Legal righteousness*, nor tends to *Satisfie God's justice*, nor *deserves* any thing of him, but is (as you truly say) the condition only of our enjoying it. -- Which condition is imposed by a new Law, &c. And when the Case in Question is, whether we have performed or fulfilled the condition of Christ's new Law or Covenant, then faith is that righteousness by which materially we must be justified, &c.

Now in answer hereto Mr. Cartwright wrote a book of *Exceptions*, entituled (*Exceptions against a writing of Mr. R. B. &c.*) wherein he finds fault with this distinction. I shall quote his own words.

P. 29. He speaks thus. 'From a twofold Covenant, you infer (*saith he*) a twofold Justification. But is there a twofold Covenant by which we are or may be justified? I conceive we are justified only by the new Covenant. For *by the deeds of the Law* (the old Covenant) *shall no flesh be justified*, Ro. 3. 20.

So p. 39. 'The new Covenant doth hold out *Christ's righteousness* to be apprehended by us, and made ours by *Faith* that so thereby we may be justified. Where the Scripture speaks of a *twofold righteousness* so as you do; or how this makes for the *unfolding* of the main Doctrine, or tends to *heal* our breaches, I do not see: you *affirm* these things, but do not *prove* them.

Again, p. 56. he hath these words. 'I confess I was not before acquainted with these two Justifications, which you speak of: I did not find them in your *Apology*, but only two sorts of righteousness as requisite

to one and the *same* Justification, so I understood it. But truly now that you lay open your conception thereof than before, I can see no *Solidity* in it. We are justified by the righteousness of Christ participated by faith; but not by faith as being *a self* our righteousness. Faith is indeed required unto Justification, yet not as our righteousness, (i.e. *Our constitutive justifying Righteousness*;) but as a condition, Instrument or means, (for I would not strive about words,) whereby we partake of Christ's righteousness. I see not that the Scripture doth speak of such a twofold Justification, one by Christ and his righteousness, another by faith as our righteousness; but only of one Justification of Christ through faith. *By him, all that believe are justified*, Acts 13. 39.

And agreeable to this is what he saith, p. 25. 'You speak (saith he) of a twofold Justification necessary to be attained. But the Scripture speaks of Justification by Christ, and Justification by faith, as one and the *same* Justification. Acts 13. 39. Ro. 5. 1. The Second cause (as you call it,) viz. (*Whether the Defendant have performed the condition of the new Covenant*;) is indeed this, whether he have any thing truly to alledge, why upon the former accusation he should not be condemned? And so he must be justified indeed by producing his Faith, (and so his sincere obedience to testify his faith,) yet not as a new righteousness of his own, but only as intiding him to Christ's righteousness, as that whereby he must be justified.

So p. 23. 'If for every several accusation, there must be a *several* righteousness, then there will be need of *Infinite* righteousnesses, seeing there may be infinite accusations. But one righteousness, viz. that of Christ's Satisfaction for us, will take off all accusations brought against us; else how doth the Apostle say, *who shall lay any thing to the charge*, &c. Ro. 8. 33, 34. Indeed the Promise is made upon condition of believing, and therefore the non-performing of the condition debars from benefit of the Promise. But this (I conceive) is not properly a new accusation, but only a making good of

of the former accusation, we having nothing to shew, why it should not stand in force against us. See also more to the same purpose, p. 55, 152, &c.

And whereas Mr. B. had charged Mr. Cartwright with owning his terms, and calling Christ's righteousness our *Legal righteousness*, Mr. C. explains himself as to this particular at, p. 48. in these words.

1. Concerning Christ's Satisfaction, how it may be called both our *Legal* and our *Evangelical* righteousness, I have spoken before. *Legal* righteousness may either signify the righteousness of the Law, *in iure*, or the righteousness which is of or from the Law, *ex iure*. There is a great difference between these two, for the former is asserted, but the latter is exploded, Ro. 8. 4. ch. 10. 5. Phil. 3. 9. Christ's Satisfaction may be called our *Legal* righteousness in the former sense, not the latter: But in both respects it is our *Evangelical* righteousness, as being the righteousness of the Gospel, *in euangelio*, i. e. the righteousness which the Gospel does hold out to us, and the righteousness which is of or from the Gospel, *ex euangelio*, i. e. the righteousness which by the Gospel we are made partakers of through faith. And therefore it is called the righteousness which is of Faith, *ex fide*, and by Faith, *ad fidem*, Ro. 9. 30. ch. 10. 6. Phil. 3. 9.

2. In that faith is the Condition or Instrument, (or what any please to call it,) whereby Christ's righteousness is made ours unto Justification, it rather follows, that faith it self is not properly our righteousness, by which we are justified.

Thus then according to Mr. Cartwright there is not a twofold Covenant by which we may be justified in our fallen state; and consequently there is not a twofold Justification according to this twofold Covenant: but Justification by Christ and Faith is one and the same Justification; and is only at the bar of the Gospel. Accordingly Christ's righteousness or Satisfaction is not strictly our *Legal* righteousness as Mr. B. calls it, tho in a very large and improper sense it may be so called, namely as it serves us instead of that righteousness, which the Law

Law required, as Mr. Cartw. explains himself, p. 38. But *strictly* and properly Christ's Satisfaction and righteousness is *Evangelical* righteousness, made ours by Faith, which faith it self is not properly that righteousness by which *materially* we must be justified, but only the condition, means and instrument, whereby Christ's righteousness is made ours unto Justification. But to pals so some other things.

In Mr. B's. forementioned *Debate with Mr. Cartwright*, he also rejects the notion of Faith's being an *Instrument*, as tho it made man his own justifier, p. 170, &c. Upon which Mr. C. in his *Exceptions*, p. 182. takes liberty to reflect on him in these words. *You stick not to brand our Greatest Divines as making man his own Justifier and Pardoner. Truly this is over-gross. What professed Adversary could reproach our Greatest Divines more than this? &c.* To which Mr. B. in his *Reply*, p. 24. makes this Reply; 'If this *Consequence* follow 'not their Doctrines then *Disprove* it. My proof is 'this. He that faith the act of my believing is the efficient cause of my Justification, doth *Consequently* 'say that I justify my self. But, &c. therefore, &c. 'The *Major* is plain, in that, (if the act be an *Instrument*, it is the *Agents Instrument*: but I am the Agent; 'therefore.) And if I do by this *Instrument* produce 'the effect, then I do *Pardon* my self, for that is the 'effect.

This argument has been already considered, and therefore I shall not speak to it again, save only to rehearse, what I find in Mr. Cartwright's *Animadversions*, and *Exceptions*, wherein I think it is sufficiently obviated. In his *Exceptions*, p. 150. he hath these words. 'For the 'term (*Instrument*) I was not willing to wrangle about 'it, neither am I willing to strive about words. Yet 'I told you, I thought it might well enough be used, 'as our Divines do use it. And I always let you know 'that tho perhaps faith may more fitly be called a *condition*, yet not so, as to make it to be merely *cause sine qua non*, but so as to ascribe some causality and *efficienty* unto it in respect of Justification, viz. in that
it

'it apprehendeth and receiveth *Christ's righteousness*; by which through faith *Imputed*, to us, we are justified.

This (as you might see by many passages) is the very reason, why (I think) the Scripture doth attribute justification to *Faith alone*, and not to *works*, nor any other grace besides faith; because only faith doth embrace Christ and his righteousness. Though therefore I neither was, nor am willing *λογουμαχῶν*, yet I neither did, nor do disclaim the word (*Instrument*,) as unmeet to be used. And indeed seeing faith hath some causality in justifying, what cause it should be rather than *Instrumental*, I do not know.

Again, p. 75, 76. he speaks thus. 'The *Similitude* betwixt the hand and faith is to the purpose, tho they differ, as you say. No similitude is to be set on the rack; if it seem to illustrate that for which it is used, it is sufficient, &c.

'If the *Propriety* of words must always by *strictly* examined, we shall scarce know how to speak. It is well if we can find words to express our selves by, as that others may understand, (if they please,) what we mean. All that our Divines mean, when they speak of faith justifying *Instrumentally*, or as an *Instrument*, I suppose, is this, and so much also they usually express. That faith doth not justify *Absolutely*, or in respect of it self, but *Relatively* in respect of its object, Christ and his righteousness laid hold on, and received by faith, &c.

And giving the reason in his *Animadversions*, p. 170. why faith is called by the name of an *Instrument*, he shews 'tis only *Metaphorically*, and in allusion to the hand's receiving a gift. *Because* (saith he) *it is as an hand to receive Christ*, (for to receive Christ and believe on him are the same, Joh. 1. 12. And the hand is *ἡ γὰρ* *ἡ πρώτη ἰσχυρία*, the prime *Instrument*, therefore I conceive it is, that faith is usually called an *Instrument*.

Now this being the explication of Faith's *Instrumentality*, that our Divines usually give, what danger can there be of making man his own *Justifier*? We may

as well say, that a *Condemned Traitor*, who puts forth his hand to take a Pardon tendred to him, does Pardon himself; or that a *beggar* gives himself Money, because he puts forth his *hand* to receive it. But to proceed,

Again in this book (*viz.* his *Debate with Mr. C.*) Mr. B. rejects that Common distinction of *fides que* and *fides quâ*, and so makes justifying faith, as justifying, to respect Christ as King, as much as Priest. For Mr. Cartwright in his *Animadversions*, speaking thus, p. 192. 'We must distinguish *inter fidem que justificat*, & *fidem quâ justificat*, &c. If Christ's Satisfaction be our righteousness whereby we are justified, and Christ as Priest Satisfied for us; then by receiving him as Priest, we are justified: tho it's true, none can indeed receive him as Priest, except they receive him as King also.

To this Mr. B. makes Reply in the same Page, (*viz.* p. 192.) in these words. 'I reverence those Learned Divines, that use to distinguish of the *Fides que* and the *fides quâ*: but indeed I am past doubt that it is here a *useless* distinction, &c.

And, p. 194. making a Reply to Mr. Cartwright's argument he hath these words. 'You argument I grant wholly, (*If Christ as Priest Satisfied*, &c.) but all you conclude is, that therefore by receiving him as Priest, we are justified. But who denieth it? You left out by (*only*) which had you put in, I had denied the Consequence with that addition. It is such another argument as this. If a man only as rich, do enrich his wife; and only as honourable, do Honour her, and only as merciful and potent doth deliver her from danger; then the act, which on her part enricheth her, is only the receiving him as a rich man, and not as an honourable man, nor as a Husband also; and the act which dignifieth her is only the receiving him as honourable. No such matter! But the receiving him as a Husband, (tho she never look to his Riches or Honour,) is that act on her part, which giveth right to his Riches, Honour and all: and then these benefits are but Consequential thereto.

And

And then, p. 195. he concludes thus; 'It is not our receiving Christ as *Priest only*, nor as *King*, but as the *Mediator God-Man*, to be our *Head, Husband, Lord,* and *Saviour*, that justifieth, as being the condition on which justification is given us. And so receiving him as *King*, hath as *near* a hand in it, as receiving him as *Priest*, &c.

From this last sentence we may learn the reason, why Mr. B. rejects this distinction of *Fides qua* and *fides quâ*; namely, to bring in Gospel obedience for a share in our justification, as well as *Faith*. But instead of making remarks of my own, I shall only transcribe a few things from Mr. Cartwright's *Exceptions*, wherein he speaks somewhat to the usefulness of this distinction, and then makes a particular Reply to Mr. B's. argument.

Saith Mr. C. in his *Exceptions*, p. 96. 'The distinction of *Fides qua* and *fides quâ*, as it is frequently used by our learned writers, so it doth hold good, notwithstanding any thing, you have said, or (I suppose) can say against it. *Quamvis hanc controversiam elevent, (saith River speaking of the Romanists) An fides qua est viva, an fides quâ est viva, ad justificationem requiratur, & Logicam tantum pugnam esse velint, Logica tamen hac pugna redem continet magis momenti. Si quis enim dicat, Christus qui homo est Infinitus, & Christus quâ homo est Infinitus, nemo Sane existimabit, nihil differre has enunciationes. Disp. de fide Just. §. 16.*

'I grant you more than you require, that not only Christ as *Lord*, but even the whole word of God, is the object of justifying faith; but not therefore of faith, as justifying. The hand may receive both Meat and Money; yet it doth not enrich as it receiveth meat, nor feed as it receiveth Money.

Again, p. 98. he hath these words. 'I grant that the receiving of Christ in respect of any one office, doth virtually include the receiving of him, in respect of all his offices: and he that doth not so receive Christ in respect of his *Priestly* office, as to be ready to receive him also in respect of his *kingly* office, when Christ shall

shall be so set forth unto him, doth not at all receive him: such a faith is a false faith, and cannot justify. Yet may there be a receiving of Christ as Priest, without an express and direct receiving of him as King; tho' implicitly and by Consequence he be received as such, &c. And that Christ sometimes is propounded only as Priest, i. e. with express mention only of his Priestly office, seems clear and undeniable by divers places of Scripture. See Joh. 1. 29, 36. ch. 3. 14, 15. And so other places, which speak of Christ as suffering for us, not mentioning his Sovereignty over us, though that is there implied, and expressed in other places. And tho' he be, (as sometimes he is) expressly set forth at once both as Priest and King, and must expressly be received at once in both respects; yet it hinders not, but that the receiving Christ as Priest, and not the receiving of him as King, is that which justifieth. One may at once receive divers things, and yet those things not all serve for one and the same use, but one thing may serve for one use, and another thing for another use, all being, though in several respects, useful and necessary to be received.

And then more directly to the above argument, he Replys thus, p. 90, 91. Faith as the condition of justification is the receiving Christ as Satisfying for us. If Christ's Satisfaction only be our righteousness; by which we are justified; and Christ as Priest only made Satisfaction for us, then by receiving Christ, as Priest only, we are justified. This you might perceive was the meaning of the argument, tho' I left out the word (only.)

And here also I have Mr. Blake agreeing with me; as (I think) in every point wherein we differ, if he have occasion to treat of it. It is true (saith he) that faith accepts Christ as Lord as well as Saviour: but it is the acceptance of him as Saviour not as Lord, that justifies. Christ rules his People, as King, teacheth them as a Prophet, but makes atonement for them as a Priest, by giving himself in Sacrifice, his blood for remission of Sins. These must be distinguished, but not divided: Faith hath an eye at all, the blood of Christ, the Command of Christ,

Christ, the Doctrine of Christ: but as it ties and fastens on his blood, so it justifies. He is set out a propitiator through faith in his blood, Ro. 3. 24. Not through Faith in his command. It is the blood of Christ, that cleanseth from all sin, and not the Sovereignty of Christ. These confusions of the distinct parts of Christ's Atonement, and the several offices of Faith may not be suffered. Scripture assigns each its particular place and work. Sovereignty doth not cleanse, nor blood command us. Faith in his blood, not faith yielding to his Sovereignty doth justify us. There are several acts of justifying Faith, Heb. 11. But these are not acts of Justification. It is not Abraham's obedience, Moses's self Denial, Gideon or Samson's valour, that was their Justification; but his blood, who did enable them in these things by his Spirit.

Young Similitude is not suitable; for a Woman receiving a man for her Husband, may be enriched or dignified by him, tho she never look at him as rich or Honourable, but only as her Husband. But we must look at Christ as Priest, and as making Satisfaction for us, that so we may be justified by him. For the Scripture doth set forth Christ unto us, in that respect for our Justification; see Rev. 1. 5. Heb. 9. 26. 2 Cor. 5. 14. Ro. 8. 34. Where those words (it is Christ that died) shew how Christ doth justify, and free us from Condemnation, viz. by dying, and so Satisfying for our sins, &c.

Again in Mr. B's. forementioned Debate, he makes faith and obedience to have the same kind of causality in Justification; and so pleads for Justification by obedience, as well as Faith. His words are these, p. 210. If Faith justifies as it is the fulfilling of the condition of the new Covenant, and obedience also be part of that condition, then obedience must justify in the same way as faith.

Upon this Mr. Cartw. thus Animadvert. Obedience is required indeed in the new Covenant, but not that thereby we may be justified, but as a fruit of that Faith, whereby we are justified.

And in his *Exceptions*, p. 133, 134. he speaks thus ;
 ' This assertion, viz. (*Faith alone* is the condition of
 ' the Covenant, so far as concerns Justification) is
 ' sufficiently proved by those places where we are said to
 ' be justified by Faith, and that without works, &c. as
 ' concurring with faith unto Justification. And for the
 ' reason, of the assertion, viz. (*because Faith alone doth*
 ' *apprehend Christ's righteousness,*) much hath been said
 ' of it before. What do our Divines most inculcate than
 ' this.

' *Wetson* saith, that faith only doth justify ; *Quia*
 ' *sola fide recta in Christum tendimus, & promissiones*
 ' *Dei de justificatione amplectimur.*

' *Amesius* saith, *Dolor ac detestatio peccati non potest*
 ' *esse causa justificans, quia non habet vim applicandi*
 ' *nobis justitiam Christi.*

' So *Bucanus*, *Fides* (inquit) *sola justificat quia ipsa est*
 ' *unicum Instrumentum, & unica facultas in nobis, qua*
 ' *recipimus justitiam Christi.*

' So *Mr. Ball* (Of the Covenant, ch. 3. p. 18, 19.) By
 ' *repentance we know our selves, we feel our selves, we*
 ' *hunger and thirst after Grace, but the hand which we*
 ' *stretch forth to receive it is Faith alone, &c.*

' You your self (saith he to *Mr. B.*) do sometimes say,
 ' that faith hath in it an aptitude to justify in this respect ;
 ' only you deny that this aptitude of faith is sufficient ;
 ' and say that therefore it doth justify, because God in
 ' his Covenant hath made it the Condition of Justificati-
 ' on. Now I also grant that if faith were not ordained
 ' to that End of God, its bare aptitude, or its being that
 ' whereby we apprehend Christ, would not justify. Yet
 ' (I say) it appears by Scripture, that because faith alone
 ' hath this aptitude to justify, (viz. by apprehending
 ' Christ,) therefore God hath made it alone the condition
 ' of Justification. This appears, in that we are said to
 ' be justified by believing in, or on Christ, which imports
 ' an apprehending and receiving of him, *Job. 1. 12.*

And agreeable hereto is what he saith, p. 114. ' Love
 ' hope and obedience are not Instruments of receiving
 ' Christ as faith is ; neither doth the Scripture make
 ' them

‘ them *conditions* of Justification as it doth *Faith*. And quoting *Arvet*, p. 39. he brings him in, speaking of the *Remonstrants*, after this manner. *Volunt igitur fidem cum operibus venire in partem justitiae debitae, & fidem justificare non relative, ut organum apprehendens obiectum, sed inherenter, &c.* Which he calls a *Mystery of Iniquity*, *Hoc iniquitatis mysterium, &c.* But to pass on.

Another thing in this book, that Mr. Cartwright excepts against, is Mr. B’s. making *Justification continued to have distinct conditions from Justification begun.*

That Mr. B. is of this opinion, my Opponent does acknowledge in his *Defence of Mr. B.* p. 17. Where he brings in Mr. B. speaking in his *Debate with Mr. Cartwright*, after this manner.

P. 252. ‘ Justification begun is continued by the *same* God, *Christ*, *Merit*, *Covenant*, but not by the *same* Condition only. I have oft proved out of many *Scriptures*, that Forgiving, Repentance of after sins, Praying for Pardon, sincere Obedience, &c. are by God made *conditions* of continuance. And (that it may not seem strange) it is usually so in almost all conveyance of Right by-Contracts, &c.

So, p. 251. he hath these words. ‘ I acknowledge that the very first point of Justification is by *Faith alone*, without either the concomitancy or co-operation of works; for they cannot be performed in an instant. But the continuance and accomplishment, of Justification, is not without the joyned Procurement of obedience.

Now on this Mr. Cartwright in the above quoted place, thus animadvert. ‘ As our Justification is begun, so is it continued. It is begun by the beginning of Faith, and continued by the continuance of Faith: though true justifying faith can neither continue nor begin, without a fitness to produce works, and so an actual production of them in due time.

And in his *Exceptions to Mr. B’s. Reply*, p. 136. We have these words. ‘ We are not to measure God’s Covenant by *Humane Covenants*. God’s Covenant doth reach

reach farther than to Justification, and more may be requisite for the enjoyment of those benefits, which belong unto *Justified persons*, than is requisite unto *Justification*.

Your Similitudes (saith he to Mr. B.) are no proofs, and you still suppose that there is one condition *at first* and another condition thereof *afterwards*; that though *at first* we are justified *only by faith*, yet afterwards by *Faith and Works*. But the works are required of Justified persons, as fruits of that faith, whereby they are justified; yet they do not therefore *concur* with faith unto Justification, which as it is begun by *Faith only*, so also is it continued. Your self observe, that *Abraham's* believing mentioned, *Gen. 15*. Was not his first act of Faith. So then he was justified before *by faith*, and so was he also afterwards, even *by faith only*, as the Apostle from that very place doth prove, *Ro. 4*. therefore *by Faith without Works*; (*viz.* as having a copartnership with faith in justifying,) *Abraham* was justified both at first and afterward.

Do you think that *Abraham* was justified from the guilt of those many *Sins*, which he committed *after* his first Justification, by his *Works*? *Credat Judens*: for my part I cannot but detest such Doctrine. I know no way whereby he could be justified from those sins, but by *Faith* in Christ, even as he was *at first* justified. Besides (as I noted before,) *Abraham* was justified before he produced that act of Faith spoken of, *Gen. 15*. and in the interim no doubt he committed some sins; yet still by *Faith*, and not by *Works*, (as *Paul* sheweth) he was justified. *V. Calv. Inst. l. 3. c. 14. §. 11.*

And, p. 85. he brings in *Calvin* speaking thus. *Namque enim sic putemus commendari post gratuitam justificationem opera, ut & ipsa in locum justificandi hominis postea succedant, aut ejusmodi officium cum fide (NB.) partiantur.* *Inst. l. 3. c. 17. §. 9.*

So Mr. Ball (of Faith, part 2. ch. 4. p. 251.) Faith doth not begin to apprehend life, and then leave it to works, that we might attain the accomplishment by them: but

it shall ever rest upon the Promise, until we come to enjoy it.

Another thing in Mr. B's Debate, that Mr. C. wright excepts against, is Mr. B's pleading for the Perfection of Justification in this life as well as Sanctification. His words are these, p. 126. 'Our Divines usually say that our Justification is Perfect, tho our Sanctification be not, and then I am sure, our righteousness must be Perfect, &c.

On this Mr. C. animadverts thus. 'True: our righteousness whereby we are justified must be Perfect. But our Divines (you know) hold, that the righteousness whereby we are justified is not our Personal righteousness, but the righteousness of Christ through faith imputed to us.

And if so, then hence I infer, that the Perfection or Imperfection of our Justification does not depend on the degrees of our Faith. For a weak faith, where it is sincere, does give an Interest in Christ's righteousness as well as a strong. And tho faith considered as a Grace in us, does admit of Degrees: yet as a Condition of our having an Interest in Christ's righteousness, so it does not admit of Degrees. For it is the least degree of sincere faith, that is the Condition, and the highest degree is no more, nor will justify any more.

And Consequently the weakest believer, who hath an Interest in Christ's righteousness is as much justified, as the Strongest. And accordingly the Scripture affirms of both, that there is no condemnation that belongs to them. Ro 8. 1. There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. If a man be in Christ, whether he be a weak or a strong believer, there is no condemnation that belongs to him; in this respect he is Perfectly justified.

And if this be so, hence also I infer, that Justification is not equally carried on with Sanctification. For Sanctification being properly carried on by Degrees, therefore we may affirm of one believer in this life, that he is Sanctified more than another: but Justification being final & single, as Divines usually speak; we cannot affirm

firm of true believers in this life, that some of them are more *justified* than others. For he that is justified is so free from all condemnation, that he is liable to no *condemnation*, Ro. 8. 1, 33, 34. And he that is so freed, is *perfectly* freed, and in this sense is *perfectly* justified.

It is true, that believers do stand in need of *new Pardon* daily, because they daily commit *new Sins*, and therefore we are taught in the Lord's Prayer to beg *daily Pardon*. But then we must *distinguish* between God's Pardoning simply as a *Judge*, and as *Paterfamilias* *Judex* as a Judge and a *Father*. Simply as a *Judge*, he Pardons but once; for those whom he takes into a state of Favour, and reconciliation, he never casts out. A believer does not presently lose his *justified state*, upon the commission of every new Sin. But when he commits new Sins, he stands in need of new Pardon: and this he hath from God as a *Father*, upon his *Repentance*; who under this notion doth Pardon sin *often*, there being sins of *Children* as well as of *Enemies*.

It must also be confessed, that believers in this life are *subject to sufferings and Death it self*. But then (as I conclude) we cannot say, that either one or the other is properly the *execution* of the Law upon them; or any part of the *Laws condemnation*. For as they are in the hand of *Christ*, and managed by God in the *new Covenant*, they are quite *another thing*, than what they were in the *threatning* of the Law, the *curse* being wholly removed from them. Accordingly we find, that the *sufferings* of believers in this life, are not properly *vindictive Punishments*, but *Fatherly Chastisements*, inflicted out of *love*, and for their good, *Gal. 27. 9. 1 Pet. 1. 6, Heb. 12. 6. Rev. 3. 19.* Whereas no such thing was threatened in the Law. Yea, their *Castigatory Punishment* is so far from being a part of the *Law's condemnation*, that it is a *means* to preserve them from falling into *condemnation*, 1 Cor. 11. 32. Neither can it be affirmed of any believers in this life, that they are *more justified* than others because they meet with *less sufferings* than others: for the *best Saints* have sometimes the greatest share in *outward affliction*. And so for *Death*, its na-

ture is altered unto true believers, its sting is removed by Christ's Death; and 'tis so far from being an Execution of the Law upon them, that 'tis put among the blessings of the new Covenant, and made Subservient unto their good, 1 Cor. 3. 22. And therefore I think, that we may conclude, that their Justification from the Law's condemnation may be said to be Perfect, notwithstanding all this.

It must also be confessed, that *some are Pardoned more sins than others*; Greater sinners have more forgiven them, than those that commit fewer sins: but yet we cannot say that the Justification of the one is more Perfect on that account, than the Justification of the other. For both being freed from the condemnation of all their sins, in this respect they are equally justified. And so we may say of Justification at our first entrance into that state, and Justification at the hour of Death, or day of judgment. At the hour of Death, or day of judgment it is to be supposed, that we shall have more sins to be forgiven, than we had at the time, when we first entered into a justified state. Therefore in this respect, our Justification may be said to increase Extensivè, as it extends to more and more sins, as they are increased more and more; tho it does not increase Intensivè, in its own nature; for at the hour of Death and day of judgment, believers are but freed from all condemnation; and this they were at their first entrance into a justified state.

It is true, in some sence, our Justification at the day of judgment will be more compleat, than what we have here: because our sins will be then more Publickly blotted out. In which sence I understand that of the Apostle, Act. 3. 19. Repent ye therefore and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord. The meaning (as I conceive) is not this, that no sins will be blotted out, till the day of judgment, (for how then could the Apostle say, there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ :) but the meaning is, then they will be Publickly blotted out. *In die judicij (inquit Maecovius de Justif. Disp. 7.) Christus non tam justificaturus est credentes,*

credentes, quàm declaraturus est ex operibus curam vobis credidisse in hac vita, & justificatos fuisse. Thus undoubtedly (saith Mr. Cartwright in his *Exceptions*, &c.) is that to be understood in *Acts* 3. 19. For without Question no sins shall then (at the last judgment) be blotted out, which were not blotted out before; but the blotting of them out shall then more fully appear than before; And therefore he concludes that the Saints freedom from condemnation *Per Sententiam Iudicis*, (of which Mr. Baxter spake) does not add to the freedom it self, but only to the manifestation of it. *The sentence* (saith he) *is indeed past already*, *Joh. 3. 18.* *The it is not so solemnly Pronounced as it shall be.* See more to this Purpose in Mr. Cartwrights *Exceptions* to Mr. B's. *Debate*, p. 69, 70, 71. See also Mr. B's. *Methodus Theol.* part. 3. p. 339. and his *Life of Faith*, p. 331, &c. where he likewise pleads for the Imperfection of Justification in this life.

Lastly, another passage that I shall remark in this Book (viz. Mr. B's. *Debate*, &c.) is what we find, p. 217. where are these words. *The Apostle doth expressly exclude the works of the Law only from Justification; but never as all the works of the Gospel, as they are the Conditions of the new Covenant.* From whence it is plain, that Mr. B. does not oppose Faith unto Gospel Works; and what is this but to confirm what I say in my *Disputation*. But to pass on to some other Books!

In Mr. B's. *Treatise of Justifying righteousness*, there is enough to vindicate what I say in my *Disputation*. He there also tells us of a *Legal* or *Prolegal* righteousness, which in Answer to Dr. Tully, he explains thus, p. 166. *I call it (Legal) as it is that Perfect righteousness of Christ our Saviour, conform to the Law of Innocency; by which he was justified, (who not Absolved and Pardoned.) I call it (prolegalis iustitia,) because that Law doth not justify us for it (but Christ only,) but by it given as ad effecta by the new Covenant, we are saved and justified from the curse of the Law, or from Damnation, as certainly as if we had done it our selves.*

If I may venture to give the meaning of this explanation, which is somewhat Intricate, I take it to be this,

That Christ's righteousness is our *Proleged* righteousness, because by it we are justified from the *Curse* of the Law. But yet it is not our righteousness, or Imputed to us in any proper sense; but only *quoad effectum*, in its effects; by procuring for us a new Covenant, our conformity whereof is our justifying righteousness.

And thus according to this explication, Christ is said to be the *Lord our righteousness*, and to be *made of God unto us righteousness*; not as his righteousness is in any proper sense Imputed to us, as our other Divines understand it: but as he Procured the new Covenant, and is the Cause of our inherent righteousness; and so he is made righteousness to us, all one as he is made Sanctification.

And thus this Scripture is explained by Mr. B. p. 64. Where speaking to it by way of objection, He is made of God righteousness to us; his Answer is. True: but how is he made so? 1. As he is made Wisdom, Sanctification and Redemption. 2. By Merit, Satisfaction, Discretion, Prescription and Donation. Here is the Meritorious cause of our Pardon, of our Adoption, of our Right to Heaven, of that new Covenant, which is the Instrumental Deed of Gift, confirming all these: and he is also our righteousness in the sense that Austin so much standeth on, as all our Holiness and righteousness of Heart and Life is all not of our Natural Endeavour, but his gift, and Operation by his Spirit, causing us to obey his Holy Precepts and Example.

Now from this Explication I cannot Learn, that Christ's righteousness is in any proper sense our justifying righteousness, or Imputed to us to that End. Christ, (saith Mr. B.) is made of God righteousness to us as he is made Sanctification, namely by way of Efficiency, by the operation of his Spirit, causing us to obey his Holy Precepts. And by Merit, i. e. by procuring for us a new Covenant, our conformity whereof is our Constitutive justifying righteousness.

Accordingly he pleads in this Book for Justification by Faith & free, not Relatively and Instrumentally considered, (saith he) is plainly Meant, that God who under the

Law

Law of Innocency required Perfect obedience of us to our Justification and Glorification, upon the Satisfaction of our *Adversary* of Christ hath freely given a full Pardon and Right to life to all true believers; so that now by the Covenant of Grace nothing is required of us to our Justification, but *Faith*: all else being done by Christ: and so Faith in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is reputed truly to be the Condition on our part, on which Christ and Life by that Baptismal Covenant are made ours.

Upon which words, Mr. Troughton in his *Last. Adv.* Part 1. p. 8. thus Glorifies: *Thus by this Author, it is not Christ's righteousness, apprehended by Faith that justifieth us, but Faith it self as including obedience, &c. the belief and Practice of the Christian Religion is our righteousness, by and for which we are justified and accepted.*

And agreeable to this is Mr. B's. finding fault, p. 26, 27. with the *Westminster Assembly*, for having those words in their *Confession of Faith*, (*not by Imputing Faith it self, or any other Evangelical obedience to them as their righteousness,*) that is, their constitutive justifying righteousness; for it is of *Constitutive* Justification they are there speaking, ch. 11. §. 1.

And tho' Mr. B. in many places of this Book, (*viz. his Treat. of Just. right.*) does exclude *Works* from Justification; yet not *Gospel Works*. And therefore he tells us, that by *Works* in St. Paul's sense as opposed unto *Faith* are meant *Mosaical Works*; and that by *Faith* is meant *new Christianity*. His words are these; p. 6, 7.

The Apostle Paul having to do with the *Jews*, who thought the *Gentiles* must become *Professors* to *Moses* as well as Christ, if they would be justified and saved, at large confuteth this opinion, and in his arguing pro- veth that the *Mosaical Law* is far from being neces- sary to the justification of the *Gentiles*, that *Abraham* and the goodly *Jews* themselves were not justified by it, but by *Faith*; and that by the *Works* of it, (and Con- sequently not by the *Works* of the Law, or Covenant of Innocency, which no Man ever kept,) no Man could ever be justified; and therefore that they were

to look for Justification by Christ alone, and by Faith
to him, or by meer Christianity, &c.

And, p. 160. Shewing in what sense we are justified
by works, he speaks thus. 'I have wearied my Read-
ers with so oft repeating in my Writings these following
assertions about Works.

1. That we are never justified first or last by works
of *Innocency*.

2. Nor by the works of the *Jewish Law*, (which
Paul pleadeth against.)

3. Nor by any works of *Merit*, in point of *Com-
mutative* Justice, or of *Distributive* Governing Justice,
according to either of those Laws, (of *Innocency* or
Jewish.)

There are several other particulars mentioned by Mr.
B. in this place, which because my Opponent hath Tran-
scribed at large in his *Defence*, I shall here omit, and
only make this brief remark upon the whole. That
the Mr. B. excludes works from Justification *Sensu Ex-
planato*, i. e. Works of *Innocency*, and *Jewish* works,
and works of *Merit* in point of *Commutative* Justice,
and works of *Merit* in point of *Distributive* Governing
Justice according to the Law of *Innocency* or the *Mosaic-
al* Law: yet he does not exclude *Gospel Works*, nor
works of *Merit* in point of *Distributive* Governing Ju-
stice, according to the *Gospel*. And therefore this will
justify more than I ascribe to him in my *Dissert.* Where
I say, that he pleads for Justification by Faith *it self*,
making no *Distinction* between Faith and Gospel
Works.

The next Book I shall turn to, shall be Mr. B's. *End
of Doctrinal controversies*; and there also we shall find
enough to confirm what I say. Page, 270. he hath these
words; 'It is true, (though some deny it,) that Faith
justifies *constitutively*, so far as it is it self our *Personal
inherent righteousness*. And, p. 273. He finds fault
with *Faith's* being called an *Instrument*. And, p. 275,
speaking to that Question, *Whether Faith justifies
by being it self Imputed to us for righteousness?* Saith he,
Two things make up the sense of Faith's being Imputed

' to us for righteousness: 1. Faith is really the Condition
 ' of the Covenant of Grace, which who so performeth,
 ' he is *Righteous* against the charge of *non-performance* of
 ' that Condition; and it is reputed our *Subordinate, E-*
 ' *vangelical, Personal Righteousness*. 2. And supposing
 ' Christ's Merits and our Redemption by him, this Go-
 ' spel righteousness is all that is required of us on our Part;
 ' instead of all that Perfect obedience, which the Law
 ' of Innocency required. So that our Faith (taken in
 ' the Scripture sense) is our *real Righteousness* Related
 ' to the Condition of the new Covenant, and instead of
 ' a mere *Perfect righteousness of Innocency*, &c.

3. Now this being so, that Faith justifies as the Condition
 of the Gospel Covenant; that Faith justifies us *Condition-*
ally, and not as an *Instrument* apprehending Christ's
 righteousness; that Faith it self is our *Evangelical Per-*
sonal righteousness, and that this Gospel righteousness
 (supposing Christ's Merits and our Redemption by him,)
 is all that is required on our part, instead of all that *Per-*
fect obedience, which the Law of Innocency required, &c.
 what is this but to say in other terms, that Christ hath
Merited that we may *Merge*; or at least, that Christ by
 his Death hath *Procured* for us a *new Covenant*, our
 conformity whereto is our *Justifying Righteousness*. And
 thus again we *establish our own Righteousness*, and set
 Christ's righteousness in this business of Justification at a
 great *Distance*, which (according to this Doctrine) is so
 far from being our *Justifying righteousness*, which we
 must desire to be *found in*, and *stand charged with* be-
 fore God, that it is in no sense properly *ours*; only this
 benefit we have by it, that it has procured for us a *new*
Covenant, which when we comply with, this compli-
 ance of ours is our *Justifying righteousness*. And there-
 fore those Persons, that are justified by the new Cove-
 nant, are more properly said to be justified by their *own*
righteousness, than by Christ's, which I shall illustrate
 by this comparison. Suppose a Person, of generous
 Temper, should by some Heroick act, or else by
 Money, obtain of his Prince a *Charter* for a *Town*, and
 thereby make them a Corporation, whereby upon such
 and

and such terms they should come to enjoy such and such Privileges; suppose, for instance, that the Charter ran thus: That those who duly serve an *Apprenticeship* should of *Amegens* be made free Denizens, and be admitted unto great Privileges. Now in this case, who would say of those that come to enjoy these Privileges after serving an *Apprenticeship*, that they do in a Sort *Advis* and *Pursue* this Freedom and these Privileges, this being all that is required in the Charter in order thereto: tho' it must be acknowledged, that they are *beholden* at a distance, to that *Deputy* who was the first *Instrument* of procuring this Charter. And so here, if *Christ* only delivered the new Covenant, by performing whereof man shall be justified, I think we may say, that such persons who comply with Gospel Conditions, are more properly justified by their *own righteousness* than by *Christ's*; tho' it must be acknowledged, that they also are *beholden* to *Christ* at a *Distance*, who was the first *Instrument* of procuring this Charter, this new Covenant for them.

And thus according to this Doctrine we shall in a sense, make Man his own Justifier; at least, we shall *establishe our own Righteousness in Justification*; and wherein this differs from the *Arminian* Doctrine, I see not.

That Mr. B. was no *Arminian* is plain from his Writings, but wherein he differs from the *Arminian* Doctrine in this point of *Justification*, I have sometimes considered, but cannot distinguish. I confess, I readily perceive a difference in their way of Expression, because Mr. B. in explaining their Doctrine, does in some places make use of our terms, giving to them a new *Meaning*: but according to the sense, he fixeth on them, I see no difference, that there is between them. For both deny the proper *Imputation* of *Christ's* righteousness; both deny the *Instrumentality* of Faith in the *Orthodox* sense; both plead for Justification by the *re Credere*; by Faith in its *absolute* consideration, as it is the fulfilling of the Gospel Condition; and both *confound* Faith and Works, as to their use and office in Justifying.

That

That this is *Mr. B's* Doctrine, I think is apparent from the above Quotation from his own Writings. And that this is properly the *Arminian* Doctrine, *Mr. B.* tells us shews in his *Lutheran* *Revel.* by manifold Quotations, some of which I shall here Transcribe. Having shewn that the Doctrine of our *late* *Authors* about Justification does differ from the Common Protestant Doctrine, he proceeds to shew, whence they received it. His words are these.

Whereas some seek some other Authors of this opinion, *Arminius* in Answer to the 31st Article objected to him, saith, *Christi iustitia imputatur in iustificandis non propter dei.* Having in general terms, *Arminius* Authors profess to acknowledge, owned that Christ's righteousness is *Imputed* to us, and that we are justified by it; yet he here denieth, that Christ's righteousness is *Imputed* to us for righteousness, &c. *Arminius* taketh *Imputing* Christ's righteousness for nothing else, but that it procureth *Justification* for us, not that it *self* doth justify us, or make us accepted of, and that the righteousness which is *Imputed* to us, whereby we are justified, is not obedience to the Law, but something else which God for Christ's sake Graciously accepteth to our Justification. What this is he expresseth, having said that Christ's righteousness is the only Meritorious cause of Pardon; *Statuo, hoc esse totum et proprium dei fidem. Hominem Credentem in iustitia ex gratia imputari, quatenus Deus Jesus Christus filium suum propositum tribunal gratiae, sine propitiacione per fidem in sanguine ipsius, hoc est. Fides est imputata to us for righteousness in as much as God hath made Christ the Tribunal of Grace; which is all one as to say with our, Christ as a King and Judge doth justify us by and for believing in him.*

And again in Answer to the 26th Article objected to him, he contendeth, that the Faith may be said to concur as an Instrument to Justification, yet the act of Faith doth justify, as it is graciously accepted for our righteousness, *Apprehensio Christi est proprium quibus instrumentum apprehendens, et quod ab eo non apprehendit.*

sur. Apprehensio autem est actio, itaque fides non quæ instrumentum, sed quæ actio imputatur in justitiam, quanquam propter illam, quem apprehendit.

Bertius in his Epistles explaineth this, that Faith is required by the Gospel instead of Perfect obedience to the Law of Works, and so justifieth as that should have done, as the fulfilling of the Command of God, with this difference, that Perfect obedience needed no Pardon and Grace, but Faith, *per gratiosam acceptationem*, of God's Gracious Condemnation, is accepted as a Man's righteousness, he being pleased to require no more of him, because of his inability to keep the Law. So then Christ's righteousness hath purchased, that we should be justified by our Faith, but it self doth not justify us.

But do the *Arminians* by Faith mean only the apprehending or trusting in Christ's righteousness in opposition to, or contradistinction from all other *Graces* and *Works* in the matter of justification? Nothing lets. By Faith they mean Obedience to the whole Gospel, and all good works they say are intended by Faith, that Faith and Repentance are all one, tho sometimes they are separated and spoken of apart for clearness sake. Thus Hornbeck proposeth their opinion, *Num coram Deo justificemur non fide apprehendendo Christi justitiam, quæ sola nobis imputetur in peccatorum remissionem, sed fide ut est actus & opus nostrum, includens in se obedientiam operum Evangelicorum, propter quam, quavis non ex ejus dignitate & merito, justificemur?* i. e. That we are not justified by Faith, as it apprehendeth the righteousness of Christ, but as it is an act or work of ours, including obedience to all the Commands of the Gospel. John Peltius hath largely shewed, that by Faith the Remonstrants mean obedience to the whole Gospel, and that this is it, by which they would have us justified. Take two or three citations. Art. 12. Parag. 6. p. 157. ex Remonst. Confess. cap. 10. *Hac ratione considerata fides, totam Hominis Conversionem Evangelio prescriptam, ambitu suo continet.* Faith comprehends Man's whole conversion, &c. Joannes Geister.

Grifter. Confes. Bons opera & gratia non pugnant inter se, & sub fide etiam bona opera comprehenduntur. &c.

Grace and works are not opposite, and Faith comprehends works.

Yea this man was so *Ingenuous* as to tell us, that we do not contend with *Papists*, whether we be at all justified by *Works*, (In this the *Remonstrants* and *Papists* are agreed,) the Question only is, by what works we must be justified? *Quando cum Papistis Disputatur, non est inquirendum an per bona opera iustificemur, sed per quæ opera?* He would only exclude *Papist Superstitious Works*, as our Authors would have the Apostle *Paul* only to exclude *Jewish Works*, or Ceremonial observations, from our Justification.

Would you have the matter yet plainer, *Adolph. Venator* will put it out of Question. *Iustificamur etiam ex operibus? Certe ita. i.e.* Are we justified by works also? Yes verily. And the *Remonstrants* in their *Apology* boldly, affirm, *Ex operibus hominem iustificari istud non tantum non est absurdum, sed verissimum esse eisdem verbis pronunciat Apostolus Jacob. 2. Nec evadent hunc istum censores, cum hunc locum pro suo more de declaratione Iustificationis intelligendum esse dicunt. i.e.* It is so far from being absurd, that a man is justified by works, that it is most true; and the express words of the Apostle *James*, which cannot be evaded by interpreting them of *Declarative* Justification.

Thus we see, that the *Arminians* meant the same thing, when they said the *re Credere*, the act and work of Faith it self doth justify us, that our late *Authors* do, when they ascribe Justification to Faith and Obedience, &c. See *Luth. Red. Part 2. p. 129. to 133.*

By the late Author *Mr. Troughton* intends *Mr. Baxter, Hotchkiss, Truman, &c.* against whom he expressly disputes. And he thought that their Doctrine and the *Arminian* Doctrine about Justification was much the same. And for my part, I cannot discern any material difference between them, as to this point. If another does, he may (if he please) declare his opinion. But can't

can't be do it without *Billingsgate language*, and Endeavouring to ruine that Brother's Reputation, who thinks otherwise? Certainly the Gospel teacheth other things. But to proceed.

In Mr. B's *Treatise of the Life of Faith*, we have for Substance the same Doctrine, as in the foregoing Quotations. For there also we have the distinction of a *Legal* (or rather *Prolegal*) and *Evangelical* Justifying righteousness; there also he pleads for Justification by Faith it self, as the *conditio præsita*, in opposition to its Instrumentality; and there also he makes no distinction between *Faith* and *Gospel Works*, telling us that by works in *Paul's* sence, as opposed unto *Faith*, are meant *Jewish Works*, the Scope of the Apostle being this to prove that we are justified by the *Christian Religion*, and must be saved by it, and not by the *Jewish*, which the *Adversaries of Christianity* then pleaded for, and trusted to. See Mr. B's. *Life of Faith*, p. 160, 328, 339, 350, &c.

I might also mention Mr. B's. *Paraphrase on the New Test.* Wherein I cannot find the least mention of the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness to believers, but another Sort of meaning put on those texts, which use to be explained this way. And here also, there is enough to vindicate what I say, viz. That Mr. B. pleads for Justification by Faith it self, not Relatively and Instrumentally considered, &c. For in his *Introduction to the Epistle to the Romans*, speaking to that Question, *How Faith is imputed to us for righteousness?* He tells us that by Faith is meant Christianity in consent, comparing it to a *Covenant* consent to a King, Husband, &c. This faith (saith he) is commanded by God, and Grace and Glory Promised to them, that by believing obey this Command; which maketh it the condition, or moral receptive Qualification of this gift, &c. Hence men may claim Pardon upon believing, &c. And, tho no Creature can Merit of God in commutative Justice, as giving him a Benefit, yet they may Merit of him as in Governing Justice, or distributive: but this is various, as the Governing Law is.

As for the notion of Faith's being an Instrument, or justifying as an Instrument as the Reverend Westminster Assembly

Assembly speak, he tells us in the same Page, that 'tis an *image Speech of vain Man's invention*. And what is all this, but to say that we are justified by Faith it self, not Relatively and Instrumentally considered.

So in his *Scripture Goss. Def.* p. 33. speaking to that Question, *Whether Faith be imputed to righteousness?* Saith he, *to have righteousness imputed to us plainly signifieth to be reckoned, accounted, reputed or judged righteous. And it is Strange, that it must not be our own righteousness, that is Imputed or reckoned to us, as our own.*

Now by the way, this opposeth the Common interpretation of other Divines. Saith Pemble (*Treat. of Justif. S. 2. cap. 2. p. 39.*) *In those places where it is said Faith is Imputed for righteousness, the phrase is to be explained Metonymically, i.e. Christ's righteousness believed on by Faith, is Imputed to the believer for righteousness.* And saith River (*in Gen. Exer. 37.*) *Distinguendum est inter has phrasas, quæ etsi in unum sensum conveniunt, differunt nihilominus in eo, quod una est figurata, altera propria. Figurata est, fides imputatur ad justitiam: propria est, Justitia imputatur credenti, &c.*

So in his *Catholick Theol. b. 2. p. 251.* speaking to that Question, *Whether Faith it self be imputed for righteousness?* Saith he, *That Faith is imputed for righteousness plainly meaneth but this, that Christ having Merited and Satisfied for us, all that is now required on our part to denominate (or primarily Constitute) us righteous, is to be true believers in him, or true Christians.*

Expressions of this Nature are very frequent in Mr. B's. Writings; but these are sufficient to shew his Judgment, and to justify what I say in my *Disput.* that he pleads for *Justification*, particularly in his *Aphorisms*, and other places, by Faith it self, not Relatively, and Instrumentally considered, &c. And now were I disposed to cast dirt in this Brother's face, and to serve him as he deals with me, I have an advantage, because he has again so grossly abused me, under pretence that I wrong Mr. B. only for declaring his plain Judgment, manifest to any that are acquainted with his Writings, and there-

therefore one would think, should not be hid from this *Author*, who tells us he is *no stranger* to them.

As for the distinction of *Faith* considered *Absolutely*, in its self, and *Relatively* and *Instrumentally*, as apprehending Christ and his righteousness; I thought this *Author* had understood the meaning of it, and had not needed one to explain it. Had he been acquainted with *Turretin's* works, as well as *Mr. B's*, he would have taught him the meaning of it, Vol. 2. p. 204, 711, 733, &c. Where he explains and confirms the distinction. However, seeing he calls on me for my meaning I shall briefly explain it.

By *Faith it self*, we mean *Faith* considered *absolute & materialiter*, the Grace of *Faith*, in its own Nature, as 'tis our act, put forth in obedience to God's Command. In which sense 'tis properly a *Work*, and falls under that obedience which the Gospel requires; for we are commanded to believe in Christ, as well as to fear God and love our Neighbour. In this sense therefore to be justified by *Faith* is to be justified by *Works*, as much as to be justified by *love, fear* and the like. Whereas the Scripture removes *Works* from Justification, and tells us that we are justified by *Grace* through *Faith*, Ro. 3. 24, 28, &c.

By *Faith Relatively* and *Instrumentally* considered we understand *Faith* together with its object, Christ and his righteousness, which *Faith Per modum Instrumenti recipientis*, as the Hand of the Soul, doth embrace and receive. And therefore in this sense to be justified by *Faith*, is to be justified by Christ's righteousness apprehended by *Faith*.

If we admit not of this distinction, we must strike out that clause in the *Assemblies Confession and Larger Catech.* (*Not imputing Faith it self, the act of believing, to them as their righteousness, but only as 'tis an Instrument, by which we receive and apply Christ's righteousness,*) and so shall fall in with the *Arminian Doctrine* of Justification by *Faith it self*, as an act of obedience, as our Personal righteousness, whereas we are laid, to be made the righteousness of God in Christ, 1 Cor. 5. 21. And to be made

made righteous to Justification by *Christ's righteousness and obedience*, Ro. 5. 18, 19.

We shall also confound *Faith and Works*, in this business of Justification, whereas in Scripture they are opposed to each other, Ro. 3. 28. *Therefore we conclude that a Man is justified by Faith, without the deeds of the Law*, Ro. 4. 5, 6. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him, that justifieth the ungodly, his Faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the Man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without Works. Gal. 2. 16. Knowing that a Man is not justified by the Works of the Law, but by the Faith of Jesus Christ, &c. Eph. 2. 8, 9. By Grace are ye saved through Faith, and that not of your selves; it is the gift of God: not of Works, lest any Man should boast.

If any say, that by *Works of the Law*, Ro. 3. 28. is meant only the Ceremonial Law, the *Mosaical Law*, which the Jews were under, but does not oblige Christians; the context will confute it. For it is that Law, by which the whole world is become Guilty, v. 19. But all the world was not under the *Mosaical Law*. Again; 'tis that Law, that is established in Gospel times, v. 31. But this is only the moral Law; the Ceremonial is abolished.

The Reverend Mr. Lyford in his Book entituled, (*The plain mans senses exercised, or a discovery of Errors, &c.*) taking notice of this very objection, p. 323. I shall Transcribe what he saith to it. 'It is objected (saith he) that when it is so often said, that we are justified by Faith without Works, without the deeds of the Law, that the word (*Works, and deeds of the Law*;) in those places, signifie one of these two things, either perfect Legal obedience, or Circumcision and such like Judaical observances, and so it is truly said, we are justified by Faith without them, that is without such perfect, absolute, unfinning obedience, and without such Judaical observances, yet not excluding but including sincere obedience.

Ans. But are not your faithful actions the works and deeds of the moral Law? that is, such as the Law

requireth you to do? Yes; why then they are excluded from Faith in this business? St. Paul excludeth the works of the Ceremonial Law from having any hand in our Justification, but not them only, but all works of the moral Law also. For,

1. His words are general and without Limitation, Ro. 4. 6. *Blessed is the Man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without Works.* Without any works. And, v. 5. *To him that worketh not, but believeth in him that justifieth the ungodly, to him his Faith is imputed for righteousness.* What works are they, the want whereof maketh one an ungodly Man? Are they not works of the moral Law? Yet he that hath not wrought them, but for lack of them deserves to be called an ungodly Man; if he believe, his Faith is counted for righteousness.

2. S. Paul excludes the works of that Law, that was given to all men, to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews; the works of that Law, which stoppeth every mouth, and curseth every Transgressor. that Law which worketh wrath; and by which is the knowledge of Sin: this must needs be the moral Law; for of the Ceremonial Law none of these things can be affirmed. We have before proved (saith he, Ro. 3. 9.) both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin, and therefore he concludes v. 28, 30. *That a Man is justified by Faith without the deeds of the moral Law, the Gentiles Law, seeing it is one God, which shall justify the Circumcision by Faith, and the Uncircumcision through Faith.* So far he.

Again, if any say, that by works mentioned, Ro. 4. 5, 6. are only meant *Legal works*, the text it self is sufficient confutation, which does not distinguish between works of this or that kind, but speaks of works indefinitely and universally, even all Sorts of works, whether performed before the Law, or under the Law, or under the Gospel, that a Man shall trust to, and depend on, for his Justification. And agreeable hereto is what Mr. Auth. Burgesse speaks in his *Treatise of Justif. Sermon 23.* Where proving that good works have not the *same* causali-

causality with Faith, and are not the Condition of a Man's Justification as Faith is; his first argument is taken from the Instance of *Abraham*. His words are these:

First I shall instance in the great pattern and Example of our Justification, *Abraham*, from whom the Apostle concludeth a Justification of all believers in the like manner he was. Now that *Abraham* was not justified by *Works*, or his working, tho' a godly Man, the Apostle makes it his whole business to prove, *Ro.* 4. 3. 4. 5. This place is judged by the *Orthodox* to be very pregnant for Justification without *Works*, even those of a Regenerate or Godly Man. For *Abraham* tho' a godly Man and the Father of the faithful, yet even then when he was godly, was not justified by any works he did, but by faith. This place is the more to be insisted upon, because it's the proper seat of Justification. The Apostle's scope is expressly to determine, how a Man is justified, and no Learned Lawyer was ever more careful to put in many words in the deeds, that he makes to exclude all cavils and shifts for the future, than was this Divine Apostle diligent to shut out all Erroneous glosses, insomuch, that we may despair of Satisfying that Man, who is not convinced from this Example. For *Bezzarius*, who useth not to be very ingenuous, doth acknowledge that this is *gravis difficultas*: for *Abraham's* works are excluded, whilst he was godly, and in the state of Grace.

Tho' this mountain be so strong, yet there are those, who set their shoulders to heave it away. What the *Papists* Answer, I shall not much matter; but what others more refined do bring in is worthy consideration.

'The works (say they) that are excluded are Works of the Law; the Law requiring a Perfect personal righteousness, cannot be fulfilled by any, only Christ Satisfied this; and then that we might be partakers of this righteousness, Faith and Good works are required as the Conditions: So that the works of the Law are excluded, not of the Gospel.

But this cannot be a solid Answer.

1. Because the Apostle speaketh *generally* of *Works* in this description of Justification, tho in other places he sometimes saith, the *Works of the Law*, yet *Abraham* could not be instanced in for such works; and therefore the Apostle speaks *universally* of works, *quæ* works. Certainly, as they say it's not fit for us to teach the Spirit of God what to say. So this is good counsel in this particular. When we read that the Holy Ghost speaks *generally* of all works, who are we, that we should *Limit* it to some? The Apostle then nameth *works*, when he treateth on purpose how we are *justified*, and *excludeth* them; and this is the more cogent, if we consider the *opposition* between Faith and Works. The Apostle directly *opposeth* the believer and the work, which could never be, if *Gospel Works* were not *excluded*; nay by this means there could be no contradiction at all, because Faith it self, if considered in Justification as a *Condition* only, it's respected as a *Work*; how then could the Apostle make such an *Immediate contrariety* between these two?

2. Again that works of all Sorts are *excluded* is plain, if you consider the *Object* of Justification, who it is that is here said to be justified, and that is the *ungodly*. By the *ungodly* is one meant, that hath not a sufficient and adequate Holiness; so that *Abraham*, tho regenerated, yet as to Justification is *ungodly*, he cannot stand before God, or endure, if all his imperfections are enquired after, &c.

Lastly that all works are excluded, is evident by the Apostles allegation out of *David*, who makes mans blessedness to be in this, that God imputeth righteousness without Works. Who can persuade himself, that *David* only excluded *Works of the Law*, when in his time, that *Question* which so perplexed the *Christian Church* in its infancy, was not started? So that the Apostle making this *righteousness* to be imputed, and that *without Works*, doth counsel a Man to exclude all *works whatsoever*, in this great point of Justification. So far he.

Again,

Again, if any say that by works of the Law mentioned, *Gal. 2. 16.* are meant *Jewish Works*, Ceremonial ones; let us hear what Mr. *Perkins* saith to this, in his *Commentary* on the place, p. 117. where are these words. 'Here it may be demanded, what *works* are meant? I answer, first not only works of the *Ceremonial*, but also of the *moral* Law. For all men know, that *Ceremonial* actions are of no use, unless they be joyned with moral Duties of love and mercy. And if *Paul* meant only *Ceremonial Works*, he needed not to have made so long a discourse against Justification by works; for he might have ended the whole matter in a word or twain, by shewing that the *Ceremonial* Law was abrogated by Christ. Secondly I answer, that not only works done before Faith are excluded, but also works that follow Faith, and are done in the Estate of Grace. For *Paul* here reasons thus; If no flesh be justified by works, then not we believers: but no flesh at all is justified: therefore not we believers. *David*, *Psa. 143.* reasoneth on the same manner; *no flesh shall be justified in thy sight: therefore I cannot; tho otherwise I be thy Servant, in keeping thy Commandments.* When *Abraham* was the Father of all the faithful, and was come to the highest Degree of Faith, and abounded in good works: yet was he not then justified by works. *Ro. 4. 1, 2.* *Paul* kept a good conscience before God and men, *Act. 23.* And yet was he not justified thereby, *1 Cor. 4. 4.* And he saith we are not saved by the works, which God hath ordained we should walk in, *Eph. 2. 9, 10.* And the works that God hath ordained for us to walk in, are the best works of all, even works of Grace, &c.

Once more, If any say that by *Works* in that other place, *Eph. 2. 8, 9.* are not meant *Gospel Works*, but *Jewish* ones; the context also will confute this. For all works are excluded, that have a tendency to *boasting*, v. 9. But *moral* works, and *Gospel* works, have a tendency to this as much as *Jewish* and *Ceremonial* ones; or rather more, because our precepts are more *excellent* than theirs, being under a *better* dispensation, they being

dealt with as *Children in non-age*. Again, they are such works, as belong to believers in *Gospel times*, and which God before ordained, that the believing *Ephesians* should walk in, v. 10. For we (i.e. we believers, both Jews and Gentiles, the Apostle speaks of himself, and other believers in his time,) are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus (i.e. in the new Testament dispensation, as that phrase is often used, particularly Gal. 5. 6. ch. 6. 15.) unto good works, which God hath before ordained, that we, (namely the Apostle, and believing Ephesians,) should walk in. And therefore by *Works*, which in this place are opposed unto *Faith*, are meant *Gospel Works*. See the Continuator's of Mr. Pools notes in loc.

Now Mr. B. as hath been shewn in the above Quotations, denies that we are justified by *Faith* only, in opposition to *Gospel Works*. And therefore in the sence I charge him with it, he makes no distinction between *Faith* and *Gospel Works*; notwithstanding this Author is resolved to file up this also, among the rest of my mistakes in matter of Fact, as he calls them. But I protest against his proceedings; he serves me in this, as he hath done in all the rest; Right or wrong, it must be a mistake, because this Author would have it so.

What tho Mr. B. does make a difference between *Faith* and *Gospel Works* in this respect, that *Faith* is our first consent to Christianity, *Obedience* is our after performing the Covenant; comparing it to a Woman's first consent at Marriage, and her after fidelity and obedience: yet this Author cannot but know, that *Faith* in this sence, (even as Mr. B. does explain himself,) falls under *Obedience*, and so is contained in the Apostle's *Works*, which he excludes from justification, and puts *Faith* in opposition to.

Besides, comparisons do not always run on all Four; neither here. There is a difference between the consent of a Woman at Marriage and her after fidelity and obedience. Her first consent can't properly be called *Obedience*, because she was not bound to it. But now our *Faith*, whereby we first consent to the Covenant, considered in it self, is properly *Obedience*; because we are

are Commanded by God to believe in Christ, or to give our consent to the Gospel Covenant, as well as to perform the terms afterwards. And therefore notwithstanding the acknowledged difference between Faith and Obedience, according to Mr. B's. explication of it; yet to be justified by Faith in his sense, as it imports our first consent to the Gospel Covenant, is strictly and properly to be justified by Obedience: for this first consent is an act of Obedience, as much as any thing else. And if Faith justify, in Subordination to its being a Condition, as an act of Obedience, then we confound Faith and Works, and so make no Distinction between them, as to their manner and way of Justifying. They both justify as Mr. B. tells us, in the same kind of causality; does one justify as a Condition? So does the other; does one justify as *Dispositio materia*, as a necessary Qualification? So does the other; does one justify as an act of Obedience? So also does the other. Where is the difference in this respect?

If any say, (as this Author brings in Mr. B. speaking,) that Faith justifies as the great principal Master Duty of the Gospel, or chief Part of its Condition: but Gospel Works do justify as the Secondary less principal parts of the Condition of the Covenant, p. 17.

To this I shall Reply in Mr. Troughton's words, *Luth. Red. p. 40, 41.* where he returns this Answer to the same objection. 1. These are but good words, giving a shew of some reverence to the plain Scriptures, that affirm we are justified by Faith without Works; for our Authors tell us, that Faith and Works do all justify in eodem genere cause, tanquam cause vel conditiones sine quibus non, i. e. as Conditions without which we cannot be justified. Now can causes all of the same kind, Conditions of the same necessity, be some principal, and others less principal? 2. Faith according to them, in its full latitude, is Universal Obedience; not a single Grace, but an acceptance of Christ as Lord and Saviour, which at most is but an act of love, and desire of Happiness through Christ, and a Purpose of obedience to him, as the Condition of it, so that
this

this Faith is indeed nothing else, but a part and beginning of good Works, and not distinct from them.

To draw to a close of this Head; if the Question be asked, *Whether we are justified at the bar of the Gospel, (at which bar only we shall be tryed, Ro. 2. 16. &c.) by our own righteousness, or the righteousness of Another? I think we must Answer (according to Mr. B's Doctrine) that Christ by his Death having procured for us a new Covenant, we are now justified by our conformity thereto, or by our complying with the terms of it, i. e. by our own personal inherent righteousness, whether we call it Faith or Obedience. But according to the old Protestant Doctrine, we are justified by Faith, in opposition to our own Obedience. And therefore we are justified by Faith Relatively and Instrumentally considered, as it apprehends and receives Christ and his Righteousness; but this Faith, where 'tis true and saving is always accompanied with Works of Love as the Natural and Genuine fruits of it, Gal. 5. 6. otherwise it is but a Dead Faith, Jam. 2. 17. and so useless.*

Saith Mr. Bradshaw summing up the usual Protestant Doctrine, 1. *Deus Pater justificat admittendo & imputando*, i. e. God the Father justifies by accepting Christ's righteousness and imputing it to us. 2. *Deus Filius Satisfaciendo & advocatum agendo*, i. e. God the Son justifies by making Satisfaction, (by working out a righteousness for us,) and pleading his Merit. 3. *Sacrosanctus Spiritus revelando & obsecrando*, i. e. the Holy Ghost justifies by revealing this righteousness and sealing it to us, by assuring us from the word that this is the righteousness we must depend on. 4. *Fides apprehendendo & applicando*, i. e. Faith justifies by apprehending and applying Christ and his Righteousness. 5. *Bona opera manifestando & declarando*, i. e. good Works do justify by manifesting and declaring the truth of our Faith, and that we are in a justified Estate.

And hence in some sense, we may be said to be justified by works, namely *Declarative*, in which sense S. James saith, that our Father Abraham was justified by Works, when he offered up his Son Isaac, Jam. 2. 21. i. e. he

he was thereby *Declaratively* justified. But if we speak of Justification *Constitutively* considered, so we are justified by Faith only, or the righteousness of Christ apprehended by Faith, and that according to S. Paul's Doctrine, Ro. 3. 28. Gal. 2. 16. Eph. 2. 8, 9, &c.

CHARGE VIth. Concerning Christ's being a Legal Representative.

§. 5. **WE** are now come to the last thing, that this Author does charge me with, and that is, that I abuse Mr. B. in *imposing to his Authority the Judgment of the Church of England in her 39 Articles, and the Assembly of Divines in their Catechism and Confession, who own Christ to be a Legal Representative.* Whereas, saith this Author, we have again read over the 39 Articles, and the Assemblies Confession and Catechism, and can find nothing in either to give the *least encouragement* unto our Author, to appeal to their Authority in this Case against Mr. B. And therefore till he produce the place, we shall conclude, that he hath not only *abused Mr. B. but also abused the Church of England, and the Assembly of Divines too.* This charge we have, p. 18.

R E P L Y

It is a rule among some, *Calumniare fortiter, aliquid adhibebit.* i. e. Reproach stoutly, cast dirt Lustily, and some will stick. This Author seems to have made it the measure of his Practice: for at every turn, he Heaps up *Reproaches.* He begins with them in his *Title Page*, where he Represents me in the front of his Book, as a *Defamer and Slanderer*; telling the world, that his Book is a *necessary vindication of the excellent Mr. B. from the false aspersions cast on him, &c.* But this Author having very slender Proof to make good his charge, as I suppose by this time the Reader is sensible, he is
pleased

pleased to make the best he can of a *bad cause*, and to make up what is wanting in evidence by *Personal reflections*. And therefore as he begins, so he continues to cast dirt all along his Book: and yet he has the *Silly boldness*, in the close of all, p. 200. to appeal to the awful tribunal of God, that what he hath done, was not in the least to Defame me. Whether he has *Defamed* me, or no; Let the *Reader*, Judge. The whole composition, (putting aside his collections from Mr. B's. Writings,) does scarce consist of Six Leaves: and in these Six Leaves I am able to shew above *Twenty* reproachful expressions. Sometimes I am a *Base Man*, basely insinuating, &c. at other times I act most unworthily and *disingenuously*. Sometimes he is pleased to reproach my *beard*, it is not long enough for this Gentleman; and at other times my *Understanding*, I am a Man of deeper confidence than *Judgment*. Sometimes he reflects on my *Reading*, and tells the World, I am a *Careless Reader*, that don't understand Mr. B's. Writings: and at other times he reflects on my *Honesty*, Candour, and Ingenuity, crying out with great clamour, that I have *abused* Mr. B. wronged him, dealt unwrighteously with him, misrepresented his Writings, *falsely* accused him, thrown dirt on him, which he has returned with *double shame* into my own face, with abundance more of such stuff, tho hitherto he has not made it appear, that I have been Guilty of one *misadventure*.

I was surprised, I must confess, to meet with such *Treatment* from this *Author*, but hearing from others the *Temper* of the Man, I understand 'tis no great wonder. That which I mostly admire at is, That the *Ingenuous* Mr. *Robinson* should, notwithstanding all this, tell the World in his *Epistle* to the *Reader*, that the *Author* does not treat his adversary with reproachful language, as is too Common; and so recommend the Book to us on that score. I am apt to think, that Mr. *Robinson* did not see clearly that day he read it; or else it gives me occasion to Image, that Mr. *Robinson* is got into a *Party*, and so is blind on one side. But to return from this digression.

That,

That, which I am accused of under this Head, is for abusing the Church of England, and the Assembly of Divines too, for bringing them to oppose Mr. B. in this sense, (*Christ was not a Legal Representative.*) We have, (saith this Author) again read over the 39 Articles, we have also read over the Assembly's Confession and Catechism, and can find nothing in either to give the least encouragement to our Author, to appeal unto their authority in this case against Mr. B.

To which I answer: had this Author as diligently perused my *Dissertation*, as he pretends to have read over those Books, he might have found some *Encouragement* sure, for this my appeal. My words are these, (p. 453.) 'It were easy to mention many Testimonies in confirmation of this Doctrine, of *Christ's being a Legal Representative.* And therefore to the Authority of Mr. B. who disputes against it, I shall oppose the Judgment of our first Reformers, *Luther, Calvin, &c.* the Judgment and Authority of the Church of England in her *Doctrinal Articles*, of the Assembly of Divines in their *Confession and Catechism*, and of the above quoted Authors, *Bishop Usher, &c.* who all establish this truth, as appears by their Doctrine of *Imputation*, both of *Adam's sin* and *Christ's righteousness*.

All the proof I pretend to bring in this place from the 39 Articles and the Assembly's Catechism, as to this particular, is from their Doctrine of the *Imputation* of *Christ's righteousness*. Having just before in my last argument, p. 448. proved that *Christ* was a *Legal Representative* from the *Imputation* of *Christ's righteousness* to believers; and having laid down this as a granted truth, (which this Author does not confute,) that *Imputed righteousness* and *Christ's being a Legal Representative* do stand or fall one with the other; I thence inferred, that the Church of England in her *Doctrinal Articles*, and the Assembly of Divines in their *Confession and Catechism*, do own *Christ* to be a *Legal Representative*, because they own the *Imputation* of his righteousness, which is built on it. And if I can prove, that they own the *Imputation* of *Christ's righteousness*, (not merely in its effects,

effects, which Mr. B. will own, but in its proper sense, which only proves Christ to be a *Legal Representative*,) where is the *Abuse*, either of the one, or the other; tho this *Author*, passing the bounds of all *Common civility* does charge me with it?

As for the *Assemblies Confession* and *Catechism*, they are very clear in this point. The *Shorter Catechism* speaks expressly of the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness. This tells us at Q. 33. That we are justified only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us and received by Faith alone. The larger *Catechism* is more full. Q. 76. *What is Justification?* Ans. *Justification is an Act of God's free Grace unto sinners, in which he Pardoneth all their Sins, accepteth and accounteth their Persons righteous in his sight, not for any thing wrought in them or done by them, but only for the Perfect Obedience and full Satisfaction of Christ, by God Imputed to them, and received by Faith alone.* And in their *Confession* they are no less express and particular. Chap. 11. §. 1. *Those whom God effectually calleth he also freely justifieth; not by infusing righteousness into them, but by Pardoning their Sins, and by accounting and accepting their Persons as Righteous: not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone: not by Imputing Faith it self, the Act of believing, nor any other Evangelical Obedience to them as their righteousness; but by Imputing the Obedience and Satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by Faith, which faith they have not of themselves, it is the Gift of God.*

§. 2. Faith thus receiving and resting on Christ and his righteousness is the alone Instrument of Justification; yet is it not alone in the Person justified, but is ever accompanied with all other saving Graces, and is no dead Faith, but worketh by Love.

Thus then it appears from the *Assemblies Confession* and *Catechism*, that they owned the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness in its Proper sense. And this Mr. B. does not deny, but rather confirms, when he tells us in his *Treat. of Justif. right.* p. 35. That this gave occasion to some Persons to write against the *Assembly's Confession*,

Confession, on this Head. His words are these; 'The rigid assertors of Imputation proved such a stumbling block to many, that they Ran into the other extrem, and not only denied it, but vehemently loaded it, with the charges of overthrowing all Godliness and Obedience. Of these *Parker* (as is said) with some others wrote against it in an Answer to the *Assemblies Confession*: *Dr. Gell* often reproacheth it in a large Book in *folio*. And lastly and most sharply and confidently *Herbert Thorndike*, &c.

Now seeing *Mr. B.* plainly tells us, that these Persons wrote against the *Assembly*, for owning the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness *it self*, and does not tell us that they abused the *Assembly* in ascribing to them such a sence, 'tis a plain intimation, that *Mr. B.* apprehended that the *Assembly* were of this opinion. And this was all I ascribed to them, that they owned the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness in its proper sence, inferring from this, that they also owned Christ to be a *Legal Representative*; because the other Doctrine is founded on this, and without this cannot stand.

Let us now hear, what the 39 *Articles* say in this business. The *Compilers* of them at Art. 11. express themselves thus. *We are accounted Righteous before God, only for the Merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own Works, or deservings. Wherefore that we are justified by Faith only is most wholesome Doctrine.*

In this *Article* about Justification, as far as I perceive, they agree exactly with the *Assembly* of Divines in their Doctrine. I see no difference that there is between them. Which I think will appear more manifest, if what the present *Bishop of Sarum* in his *Exposition of the 39 Articles*, particularly what he saith in his explication of the 9th *Article* about *Original Sin*, be duly considered. For he there speaks of the Imputation of Christ's righteousness, as well as the Imputation of *Adam's sin*. Explaining their sence, who ground the Imputation of *Adam's sin* on a supposed Covenant made with *Adam* as the *Representative Head* of Mankind, (which his Lordship saith

faith was the known Tenet of the *First compilers* of the 39 Articles, who were *St. Austin's Followers*,) he proceeds to tell us, that they grounded this Doctrine of theirs, on that large discourse of *St. Paul* in the 5th. to the *Romans*, where he compares the blessings we receive by the Death of *Christ*, with the Guilt and Misery that was brought upon us by the sin of *Adam*. Now it is confessed, that by *Christ* we have both an *Imputation* or communication of the merits of his Death, and likewise a Purity and Holiness of Nature conveyed to us by his Doctrine and Spirit. In opposition then to this, if the comparison is to be closely pursued, there must be an *Imputation* of Sin, as well as a corruption of Nature Transfused to us from *Adam*. This is the more considerable as to the point of *Imputation*; because the chief design of *S. Paul's* discourse seems to be levelled at that, &c. See *Dr. Burnet on the 39 Articles*, p. 113, 114, 115.

Now from this explanation, I think we may Venture to infer this, that the *Imputation* of *Adam's* sin and *Christ's* righteousness, in its proper sense, was the mind and opinion of the first compilers of the 39 Articles; seeing they were of *St. Austin's* opinion, as to this point. Touching the *Imputation* of *Adam's* Sin, the Case is clear, for his Lordship tells us, that they founded this on a supposed Covenant, made with *Adam*, as the *Representative Head* of Mankind. And seeing they insist on the Apostle's Parallel between *Christ* and *Adam*, *Rom. 5.* and do make the opposition in all things *Quadrare*, both as to the derivation of *Adam's* Guilt, and the corruption of his Nature: hence I think, without injury to them we may infer this, that *Christ's* righteousness according to them is *Imputed* to us, in the same sense that *Adam's* sin is *Imputed*; and therefore *Christ* in their opinion was a *Representative* as well as *Adam*.

And thus, I think, I have made it appear, that I have not abused the Assembly of Divines, nor the compilers of the 39 Articles.

I might farther add *ex abundanti*, that the Assembly of Divines seem express in the Case. I shall take it for granted

granted 'till I see it disproved, that the Doctrine of the Church of England in the 39 Articles is the same in this point with that of the Assembly in their Catechism and Confession. But the Assembly of Divines do own Christ to be a Federal Head and Legal Representative, in their Larger Catechism, Q. 31. where they express themselves thus. *The Covenant of Grace was made with Christ, as the Second Adam, and in him with all the Elect as his seed.* What is this but to say in other terms, that Christ was a Federal Head? As that expression in the Shorter Catechism, (*The Covenant being made with Adam not only for himself, but for all his Posterity,*) does prove Adam to be a Federal Head and Legal Representative: so these words, (*The Covenant of Grace was made with Christ as the Second Adam; &c.*) do also prove Christ to be a Federal Head and Legal Representative. He was so in the Covenant of Redemption, or that Branch or species of the Covenant of Grace, that was made with Christ, wherein he consented to put himself under our Law, to obey and die in our stead, in order to make Satisfaction for Man's sin: tho he was not so, in the other branch or species of the Covenant of Grace, namely that which is made with us, in order to be interested in Christ's Satisfaction, for he did not repent for us, and believe for us.

Agreeable to this is Mr. Thomas Vincent's Explanation of the Shorter Catechism, recommended to us by no less than 40 worthy Ministers, who have all prefixed their names to it; viz. Dr. Owen, Dr. Manton, Dr. Jacomb, Mr. Caril, Mr. Jenkin, Mr. Case, Mr. Griffeth, Mr. Fowler, Mr. Wason, Mr. Stubbs, Mr. Lye, Mr. Doolittle, Mr. Calamy, Mr. Canton, Mr. Hides, Mr. Barker, Mr. Wells, Mr. Veal, Mr. Mayo, Mr. Jarmay, Mr. Sylvester, &c. So that it is an approved Book, and what is supposed to contain the true sense of the Assembly's Doctrine. And in this Book we are expressly told, that the Covenant of Grace was made with Christ, as a Representative, or that he was a Federal Head. For in explaining that clause at Q. 20th. (*God's entering into a Covenant of Grace, to deliver us out of the Estate of sin,* and

and Misery.) the Author has these following Questions and Answers.

Q. With whom was the Covenant of Grace made?

Ans. As the Covenant of Works was made with the first Adam, and all his Posterity; so the Covenant of Grace was made with Christ, the Second Adam, and in him with all the Elect, as his seed, which are the Israel of God, Gal. 3. 16, &c.

Q. Was it the same Covenant, which was made with Christ and the Elect?

Ans. No; For there was a Covenant which God made with Christ, as Mediatour, and the Representative of the Elect, which was the Foundation of all that Grace, which was afterwards Promised in that Covenant of Grace, which he made with themselves in and through Christ.

Q. What was that Covenant, which God made with Christ, as the Head and Representative of the Elect?

Ans. God did Covenant and Promise to Christ as the Representative of the Elect, that upon Condition he would submit to the penalty, which the sin of the Elect did deserve, and undertake in all things the office of a Mediator, he should be successful, so as to justify and save them. *Isai. 53. 10, 11. When thou shalt make his Soul an offering for Sin, he shall see his seed, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his Hand; and by his knowledge shall my righteous Servant justify many.*

So then according to this Explanation the Assembly held Christ to be a publick Representative: and that the Author did not mistake the sense of the Assembly as to this particular, is plain from what themselves say in their larger Catechism, as above noted. But this, as I said, is more than need having sufficiently cleared my self from this Author's charge, by what I said in the foregoing Answer.

There is one thing more that is yet behind, and that is to consider that General Remark, that this Author makes on that part of my Disputation which does Expressly concern Mr. B. which this Author having named,

he

he shuts up all with this *Triumph*. And thus while he seems to himself (and it may be to some few others,) to smite his Adversary hip and thigh, with a great slaughter, he really wounds no one but himself; or those of his friends who intrusted him with the defence of the cause he has betrayed.

R E P L Y.

Whether this *Author*, or his Friends that employed him, have any great reason to boast of his *victory*, or that *advantage* he hath brought to their cause, I shall leave to be considered by him and them. This I will Venture to say of him; that he does not appear the most *Formidable* Adversary, notwithstanding all his big words, that ever Man met with. And were I put to it, to Venture again in a *Second Engagement*, and there to defend my *Disputation* in point of *Doctrine*, as here I have done as to *matter of Fact*, I verily believe that the force and dint of this *Author's reasoning* (as well as his *Collections*,) would not make me afraid. Not that I delight in a *litigious* argument, 'tis contrary to my temper; I am for peace; I would gladly be employed in healing our breaches, not in making our differences wider; but only to give a little *check* to this *Author*, that he may not be wise in his own conceit; because he calls my *Disputation* a *Daughit*, p. 18. And also tells us, p. 19. that he could have detected several of my mistakes in *Point of Doctrine*, the very naming of which would expose them.

But to return to this *Author's triumph*. Considering that mighty *triumph* he makes, we may well expect, that it was occasioned by some notable *Exploit*. And what is it? why nothing else but a *General Remark*.

Know, *Reader*, that this *General remark* is on that particular proposition that *ex professo* I do Examine, and for which I quote both Book and Page, and from whence I deduce the main Scheme of *Baxterianism*: and therefore I wonder, that this must have only a *General remark*, when other things mentioned only in the *General*, without quoting Book or Page, have passed

under a *particular* trial. This does not look like *fair* dealing: but perhaps there was some *reason* for it; I leave others to *Guess* at it.

Well, seeing we must be put off with a *General Remark*, where we expected a *close* and *particular* Examination; let us hear what it is. Why, in short 'tis this, brought in after this manner, p. 19. 'Having gone over 'the several Heads wherein he hath wronged Mr. B. (and 'detected his mistake) in *matter of Fact*, &c. we shall 'make only this General remark on that part of his 'Disputation relating to Mr. B. concerning Christ's Federal Headship, viz. That where he pretends to prove, ' (and if he would say any thing to the purpose against 'Mr. B. ought to prove,) that Christ was included in the 'first Covenant, and that the Law of Innocency was so 'Constituted, that whether Christ or we obey or suffer, 'it was in Effect the same thing, he being our proper 'surety, or Legal Representative: We say, when he 'should prove this, and pretends to undertake it, we 'find him changing his Legal Representative (when he 'finds himself pinched,) into a Representative by Vertue of the Covenant of Grace. And so either by making 'non-sence of it, saith nothing for or against any one: or 'by changing the sence of his Representative and Federal 'Head, saith no more than Mr. B. and those whom he 'calls his Followers would agree to.

To which I answer, this *General Remark* consists only of 3 *Suggestions*, not one of them *true*; and therefore it *Dwindles* into nothing, notwithstanding this *Author* was resolved to *triumph* so mightily on it, as the now, he had smote his Adversary *hip and thigh*; or rather had made him by this *General Remark* to wound *none* but himself.

1. He suggests, that if I would say any thing to the purpose against Mr. B. I ought to prove, that Christ was included in the first Covenant. To which I answer, if so be it appears that Mr. B. in the proposition I examine, disputes against Christ's being a Legal Representative in any sence, either by Vertue of the Covenant of Works, or by Vertue of the Covenant of Grace, then I am not obliged,

obliged, if I would dispute against Mr. B. to prove that Christ was included in the first Covenant. But Mr. B. disputes against Christ's being a *Legal Representative* in any sence, even by Vertue of the Covenant of *Grace*, as well as by Vertue of the Covenant of *Works*, as is plain from his own *Propositions*, wherein he does make no *Limitation*, but speaks Indefinitely and Universally, as we find them set down in his *Book of Redemption*, p. 33. 67. His words are these. *Christ died nullius loco, so as strictly and properly and fully to represent men's Persons, as if sensu legali vel civili, they themselves did suffer and Satisfie.* So, p. 67. *Christin suffering did not strictly and properly bear and represent the Person of the sinner so as civiliter, moraliter, legaliter, it might be said, that we either Satisfied or suffered by Christ.* Least any with this Author should mistake Mr. B. as tho he meant only a *Legal Representative*, as that term may Relate to the Covenant of *Works*, he explains himself in other expressions, (*Moraliter, Civiliter, in sensu legali vel civili*) and so excludes Christ from being a *Civil* as well as *Legal Representative*, if we must make a distinction between them. In a word, he denies Christ to be a Representative in a *Law-sence*, in a *Judicial sence*, which is what Mr. B. meant by *Legal*, and so this phrase is equally applicable to a Representative by Vertue of the Covenant of *Grace*, as well as to one by the Covenant of *Works*. So that this first suggestion is *untrue*, a meer *shift*, and what Mr. B. will not own, who disputes at large against Christ's being a *Legal Representative* in either sence.

If this was not Mr. B's design, how comes it to pass, that in stating of the Question he does not tell us, that tho he disputes against Christ's being a *proper Representative* by Vertue of the first Covenant, yet he owns him to be so, according to the tenour of the Covenant of *Grace*? We find nothing of this in his stating of the Question, p. 67, 68. tho he is particular as to other matters.

I must profess, that when I read his Book, I thought he opposed Christ's being a *proper Legal Representative*

in any sence. And so, I believe, will any Impartial unprejudiced person, that shall read what he saith in that place. I see nothing to alter my mind, either in the terms of the *Propositions* which he lays down, wherein he speaks Indefinitely and Universally; neither in his explaining and stating the Question, where no such Limitation as this, (*viz. I dispute only against Christ being a proper Representative by the Covenant of Works,*) is to be found; neither can I guess by the *Arguments* he brings to confirm what he saith, that 'twas his design to allow Christ to be a *proper Representative* by the Covenant of Grace, tho he denied him to be so, by the Covenant of Works, because his arguments are levelled at large against Christ being a *proper Representative* in any sence. And what less is imported in those words of his under the first Argument, (*Univ. Red. p. 69.*) *The assertion which I deny (is,) that Christ so represented our Persons in suffering or Satisfying, as that Legaliter vel Civiliter, we may be properly said, to have suffered or Satisfied in him; so that tho it was Christ's person Naturally, yet it was ours Legally, Morally or Imputatively.* What words can be fuller to exclude Christ, from being a *proper Representative* in any sence, either by Vertue of the Covenant of works, or Grace?

And to put matters beyond all doubt, he tells us himself in some other of his Writings, that in this point, he disputes with others besides the *Antinomians*. See his *Treatise of the Life of Faith*, p. 310. Where are these words.

' Some there are (besides the *Antinomians*.) that hold
' that Christ did *Perfectly obey* and *suffer*, not in the *Natural*, but in the *Civil or Legal Person* of each sinner,
' that is *Elect*, (representing and bearing as many distinct persons as are *Elect*.) so fully, as that God doth
' repute every *Elect* person, (or say others, every *believer*.) to be one that in Law sence, did *Perfectly obey*
' and *Satisfie Justice* himself, and so imputeth Christ's
' righteousness and Satisfaction to us, as that which was
' *Reputatively* or *Legally* of our own Performance, and
' so is *ours*, not only in its *Effects*, but in it self.

' Others

' Others seeing the pernicious Consequences of this opinion deny *all Imputed Righteousness* of Christ unto us, and write many reproachful volumes against it; as you may see in *Thornike's* last works, and Dr. Gelland *Parker* against the *Assembly*, &c.

So that Mr. B. does own a difference in this point, between *himself* and the *Westminster Assembly*. And this, I suppose, occasioned that *untoward* Insinuation of his, (in his *Treatise of Justifying Righteousness*, p. 26.) as tho the *Sevoy Confession*, (and the *Assembly's Confession*, which hath for substance the same Doctrine,) was drawn up by Persons, that had *inclination to Antinomian principles*. For according to Mr. B. all those that own Christ to be a *Legal Representative*, (a proper Representative,) do incline to *Antinomian principles*. Thus much we may learn from what he saith, in his *Fourth Disputation about Justification*, p. 382, 383. Where speaking to that Question, *How Christ died loco nostro*? I cannot find by his stating of it, that he owns Christ to be a *proper Representative* in any sence, but chargeth all those with *Antinomianism*, that do maintain it. His words are these.

' The wrong understanding of this point, (*Christ dying loco nostro*,) is the very turning point to *Antinomianism*, and the very *Primum vivens & ultimum moriens*, the heart of the whole System of their Doctrine.

' That Christ in the Person of Mediator, did suffer upon his voluntary undertaking, what we should have else suffered, and thereby made Satisfaction to God's Justice for the breach of his Law, both Father and Son, (whose will is one) agreeing or resolving, that yet no Man should have actual Remission or Salvation thereby, but on Condition of receiving the Redeemer for their Lord and Saviour, and thus Christ died *loco omnium*; this is sound Doctrine. That at the same time it was the secret will or eternal decree of the Father; and the will of the Mediator *de eventu*, to give effectually grace to believe to his chosen only; and consequently that they only should be actually saved, and

thus he died *pro Electorum*, is also sound Doctrine. But that Christ in dying did strictly Represent the Person of the Sinner, so as either naturally, or morally in Law sense, we may by said then in, or by him, as the Law calls that the action of the Principal, which is done *Per Delegatum, Deputatum, Vicarium, &c.* this is the Soul of *Antinomianism*; and directly and unavoidably introduceth Justification before Faith, or before we are born, the non-necessity of any other Justification but in *foro conscientiae*, it certainly overthroweth all Pardon of Sin at all, and so all Petition for Pardon, and all thanksgiving for it, with the rest of their Errors: yea, makes Man his own Redeemer.

Now let any Man Judge, whether he does not in this place, oppose Christ's being a *strict proper Representative* in any sense, as well by Vertue of the Covenant of Grace, as by Vertue of the Covenant of Works.

Indeed Mr. B. in some places of his Writings, will condescend so far to others, (seeing 'twas the Doctrine of our first Reformers, and the Common Doctrine received among us,) that they may (if they please) use the term *Representative*, so they will state it, and use it only in a very large and improper sense, (in which sense, by the way, the Socinians themselves will allow Christ's Deity and Satisfaction;) but as for himself, he does not delight in this term, as is plain from several passages, particularly in his Treatise of *Justifying right*. p. 96. where disputing against Christ's suffering in the Person of sinners, he brings in this by way of objection.

Obj. Christ bare both his own Person, and ours: it becometh to him as Mediator to personate the Guilty sinner.

To which he thus Answers.

Ans. It becometh to him as Mediator to undertake the sinners Punishment in his own Person. And if any will Improperly call that, other Personating and Representing of the sinner, let them limit it, and confess that it is not Simply, but *in tantum*, so far, and to such uses, and no other, and that yet sinners did it not in, and by Christ, but only Christ for them, to convey the benefits

benefits as he pleased; and then we delight not to quarrel about mere words; tho we like the phrase of Scripture better than theirs. See also more to the same purpose, p. 56, 58, &c. Where in a large and improper sense, he will (for peace sake) allow Christ to be a *Representative*. But that he does not own him to be our *Surety*, and a proper *Representative*, I think will appear from what he saith, p. 107, 108, &c. where shewing in what sense, he disputes against Christ being a *Representative*, he hath these words.

The sense of those men, that I differ from and write against, (the *Libertines* and *Antinomians*, and some others, that own not those names,) is this: that a *Legal Person is one so Related to another's natural Person as that what he hath, doth or suffereth in such a Case, is (not only effectual, as aforesaid to others, but is) in it self Simply reputed or Imputed to be morally, tho not Physically, the habit, act and suffering the Merit and Satisfactory Sacrifice of the other Person: and so being the Reputed haver, doer or sufferer, Meriter or Satisfier himself, he hath absolute right, to all the proper results and benefits.*

And so a Man may indeed many ways among us *Represent* or *Personate* another. If I by Law am Com-manded to do this or that service *Per meipsum aut per alium*, I do it in the moral or Law-sense, because the other doth it in my name, and I am allowed so to do it. So if I appear or Answer, by any Proctor or Attorney; if the Law make it equal to my Personal appearance and Answer, it is said that *I did it by him*: (but only so far as he doth it as my *Representer* or in my name:) so if I pay a debt by the Hand of my *Servant* or any messenger, if so allowed, I do it *by the other*. So indeed a *Pupil* doth by his Guardian, what his Guardian doth, only so far as the Law obligeth him to consent, or stand to it.

We did not thus our selves fulfil all the Law in and by Christ: nor are we thus the *Proprietors* of his habitual Perfection, Merits or Satisfaction.

: The

• The Common reason given by the contrary minded
 • is, that he was our *Surety*, or *Sponsor*, or *Fidejussor* :
 • and so we translate *ἵππο* & Heb. 7. 22. and I remem-
 • ber not any other text of Scripture alledgable for that
 • title. But this word doth not necessarily signifie any
 • such *Representer* of our Persons, as aforesaid. Nay,
 • when he is called thus, the *Fidejussor* of a better Cove-
 • nant, it seemeth plain, that it is God's Covenant as
 • such, and so God's *Sponsor* that is meant ; and as *Gra-
 • tian* saith, *Moses pro Deo spondit in lege veteri : Je-
 • sus pro Deo in lege nova : lex utraque & pactum con-
 • tinet, promissa habet, &c.* So also Dr. *Hamond*, [He
 • was *Sponsor* and *surety* for God, that it should be made
 • good to us on God's part, on Condition that we Performed
 • that which was required of us, &c.]

Now according to this explication of a surety, Christ
 in that office was God's *Representative*, not *Man's* ; which
 I shall not stand to consider now : as neither to explain
 and state this point, wherein and how far Christ was a
Representative, which is a Doctrine that must be limit-
 ed. And therefore we cannot approve of those terms,
 that Mr. B. useth in Representing the sence of all those,
 who own Christ to be a *Legal Representative*, either
 here or elsewhere : for he usually clogs his Explication
 with such terms, that they will not allow, and puts the
 good and bad sence together, and then promiscuously
 disputes against both. But passing by this ; the main
 thing that I aim at, is only to shew, that Mr. B. does
 not own Christ to be a *Proper Legal Representative*, or,
 a Representative in a Civil, moral or Law sence, as he
 explains it.

Which also appears from what he saith, p. 122, 123,
 &c. in Answer to an objection of Dr. Tully, whose ob-
 jection was this.

Obj. *You have said that tho we were not Personally
 but seminally in Adam, when he sinned ; yet when we are
 Persons ; we are Persons guilty of his Actual sin : and so
 we must be Persons that are partakers of Christ's actual
 Righteousness, and not only of its Effects, as soon as
 we are believers. For Christ being the Second Adam and
 Publick*

Publick person, we have our part in his righteousness, as truly and as much as in Adam's sin.

Now in answer to this, Mr. B. gives us plainly to understand, that he neither owns *Adam*, nor *Christ* to be *Legal Representatives*. For with reference to *Adam* he hath these words. ' It is an adding to God's word ' and Covenant, to say that he Covenanted that *Adam* ' should *Personate* each one of his Posterity in God's *Imputation* or Account, any farther than they were *Naturally* in him.

Here *Adam* is removed from being a *Legal Representative*, and *Federal Head*. For if he *Personated* us no farther than we were *Naturally* in him, then he *personated* us no more than our *immediate Parents* do, for we were also *naturally* in them. And consequently according to Mr. B. our *Immediate Parents* are *Legal Representatives* as well as *Adam*, if we must keep that term. Or rather, according to him, *neither* of them are *Legal Representatives*, for none do affirm it of our *Immediate Parents*, that I know of.

And thus denying *Adam* to be a *Legal Representative*, the Apostle's Parallel between *Christ* and *Adam*, Ro. 5. is overthrown. The Apostle tells us, that *Adam* was *Christ's figure*, v. 14. But wherein was *Adam* *Christ's figure*? Was it as he was a *Natural Head*? That cannot be; for as Mr. B. tells us, p. 124. *Our persons were not naturally and Seminally in Christ's Person, as they were in Adam's*. Was he then the figure of *Christ*, as a *Federal Head*, and *Legal Representative*? Why, according to Mr. B. *Adam* was not a *Legal Representative*, he *personated* us no farther, than we were *naturally* in him. Thus the *Analogy* between *Christ* and *Adam* is taken away, and the Apostles Parallel, as to the way and manner of communicating Sin and Righteousness, v. 19. is made insignificant. The Apostle tells us, that *as by one Man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous*. How were we made sinners by *Adam's* disobedience? Why according to Mr. B. not as he was our *Federal Head*, our *Legal Representative*, but because of our *natural interest* in him: now

no such thing can be affirmed of *Christ*, and therefore the *Apostles Parallel* is spoiled.

Yea Mr. B. is so far from grounding the *Imputation* of *Christ's* righteousness on his being our *Legal Representative*, that in this his Answer to Dr. Tully he disputes against it.

For, p. 124. he speaks thus; 'If *Christ* and we are reputed one Person, either he obeyed in our Person, or we in his, or both. If he obeyed as a Reputed sinner in the Person of each sinner, his obedience could not be Meritorious, according to the Law of Innocency, which required sinless Perfection; And he being supposed to have broken the Law in our Persons, could not so be supposed to keep it. If we obeyed in his Person, we obeyed as Mediators, or *Christ's*, of which before.

To which I answer by this Parallel instance; If a *Burgess* in Parliament and those he Represents, be Reputed in Law one Person, then either he acts in the Parliament House in their Persons, or they in his, or both. If he acts in their Persons, or in the Person of each Private Man, whom he represents, then what he does there is of no value according to Law, which requires such Persons as sit there, not to act as Private Persons, but as Publick Representatives. And if they act in his Person, then they act as Publick persons, and so each Private person whom he represents, may justly be esteemed a *Parliament Man*, or *Burgess* himself. The same way we answer this, we may Answer the other.

The difficulty also is the very same, with reference to *Adam*, and the *Imputation* of his sin. Either *Adam* sinned in our Person, or we in his, or both. If he sinned in our Person, (namely considered as a Private person, such as we are,) then his sin could not reach us, for what is *Another's* sin to me. If we sinned in his Person, (considered as a Publick Representative,) then we sinned as Publick persons and Representatives, and so may be said to destroy the world, as well as *Adam*, to which I have spoken elsewhere.

From the whole we may learn, that *Christ*, according to Mr. B. was not a *Legal Representative*, and that
none

none of his actions were *Imputatively* ours. Which also is confirmed by divers other places in this Book. See p. 95, 96, 127, 191, &c.

I am not desirous of *misrepresenting* Mr. B's Doctrine, whose many Laborious and *useful* Writings have justly gotten him a very great *esteem*: I only seek after *truth*, and plead for *Peace*. If what I have written shall bring any light to the truth of the Gospel, or occasion some Person in a sober way, without *Scurrillous* reflections, to put matters in a better light, for my Information as well as others; I have my *End*, in a great measure. And if Mr. B. had not given *hard names* to those that differ from him in this point, and in many of his Writings told us that the Doctrine of Christ's being a *Proper Representative* is a *Subverting point of the whole Gospel, the Soul of Antinomianism, &c.* (See his *Univ. Red.* p. 68. his *Treat. of Justif.* right. p. 91. his *Script. Gosp. Def.* p. 23, 109. his *Life of Faith*, p. 310, 332. his *Fourth Disput. about Justif.* p. 383, &c.) which I find is *abused* by some of his Followers to the *Disturbance* of the Churches Peace, I had never medled with that much *Celebrated* name.

The Question is, whether Christ is a *proper Representative* in a *Law sence*, in a *Judicial sence*; call it *Civil* or *Legal*? Our first Reformers and other Divines maintain the Affirmative; that he was so by Vertue of the *Covenant of Grace*, tho not by Vertue of the *Covenant of Works*: which Doctrine I take to be denied by Mr. B. My Opponent tells the world with great clamour, that I *misrepresent* Mr. B's Doctrine, and that he owns Christ to be a *Representative* by Vertue of the *Covenant of Grace*, tho not by Vertue of the *Covenant of Works*. If he does so, we have no other way to know it, but by his Writings. And therefore let this *Author* prove, if he can, from Mr. B's Writings, that he owns Christ to be a *Proper Representative*, according to the tenour of the *Covenant of Grace*, tho not by Vertue of the *Covenant of Works*; and then indeed he will make it appear, that Mr. B. and we are agreed: but till then, I must crave leave to think, that he is not of *this Judgment*. Which

to me is evident from the *above Quotations* ; and from what he saith in his *Catholick Theology*, p. 38. n. 41. where are these words.

Christ did not take upon him strictly and Properly the natural or *Civil Person* of any sinner, much less of all the Elect, or all sinners ; but the Person of a Mediator between God and sinners.

What is this but in plain terms to deny Christ to be a *Proper Representative*? As to what he saith in the same Page (n. 41.) *That Christ was not our Delegate, Deputy, Minister or Instrument to do what he did in our Names, by Representing our Persons, as a Man's Servant payeth his Master's debt by his Command, &c.* (which by the way, is the Common Illustration he makes use of at every turn to expose this Doctrine,) this hinders not Christ from being our *Representative* ; for tho he was not our *Delegate*, or chosen by us, yet God chose him as he did *Adam* ; and there are other *Representatives* besides *Servants*, such as *Saracens*, &c.

Moreover, that Mr. B. denies Christ to be a *Proper Representative*, even by Vertue of the *Covenant of Grace*, is plain to me from this argument, because he denies all *Proper Imputation of Christ's righteousness to us*, esteeming this a *Dangerous Doctrine*, an *Antinomian Error*, and therefore he strenuously *Disputes* against it.

1. He esteems it a *Dangerous Doctrine*. See his *Debate with Mr. Cartwright*, p. 73. Where are these words.

Tho I will not be so Peremptory as to condemn them that maintain, [the *Imputation of Christ's righteousness of this kind, as made ours only by Faith, upon the Right of Union, as being Civiliter one Person with Christ.*] tho I hold it a perilous Doctrine: yet I utterly Renounce their Doctrine, that make this righteousness ours, on the ground of our Interest in the mere payment, before any Faith, as if Christ obeyed in *nostrâ persona*, and to make us one with Christ before Faith, &c.

In this place Mr. B. mentions two Sorts of Persons.

1. Those that ground the *Imputation of Christ's righteousness*

ousness it self, (his conformity to the precept of the Law,) on his being *Civiliter* one Person with us, when we do Believe ; or in other terms, on his being a *Legal* or *Civil Representative*, according to the tenour of the *Covenant of Grace*, for it is only this *Covenant* that requires *Faith*, in order to be *Interested* in *Christ's Representation*. And 2. Those, who make this *Righteousness of Christ ours*, on the Ground of our Interest in the mere payment, before any *Faith*, as tho *Christ* was an *Antecedent*, not a *Consequent Surety*. And as he rejects this latter opinion with great abhorrence, and with good Reason, it being properly the *Antinomian Doctrine* ; so he also esteems the other opinion, (viz. of *Christ's* being a *Proper Representative*, and that by virtue of the *Covenant of Grace*,) a *Dangerous Doctrine*.

2. He calls it an *Antinomian Error* : and therefore giving us a *Catalogue* of those *Errours*, which *Constitute* the *Body of Antinomianism*, he reckons this for one among the rest, (namely, to say that *Christ* obeyed and suffered in the *Person of the Elect*, in *God's* account, so that his *righteousness of Obedience* and suffering is *Imputed* to us, not by an *after donation* in the *Effects*, but by this *strict Imputation* in it self.) See his *Life of Faith*, p. 321. Where it is expressed more at large. From whence we may learn, that the *Doctrine of Proper Imputation*, or of the *Imputation of Christ's righteousness it self*, is according to *Mr. B.* an *Antinomian Error*.

3. He strenuously *Disputes* against it. See his *Life of Faith*, p. 322. Where he brings no less than 12 arguments for the *confutation* of it. Which, tho I confess is somewhat alien from my *Present purpose*, I shall briefly consider ; because I find them newly *Published* by my *Opponent* in his late Book, (viz. *The Principles of the Christian Religion explained*, p. 137, &c.) in order to *Propagate* this *new Doctrine*, the *Imputation of Christ's righteousness*, not in it self, but in its *Effects* only ; tho our *First Reformers*, and the *Assembly of Divines* were of another *Judgment*. The arguments as set down by *Mr. B.* in his *Life of Faith*, p. 322, &c. stand thus.

Arg. i.

Arg. 1. God is not mistaken, to judge that we obeyed or suffered when we did not.

Ans. It is no mistake, to Impute to the *Debtor* what is done by his *Surety*, in his behalf: or to Impute and reckon to the *Represented*, what is done in their name, by their *Proper Representative*. If therefore we distinguish between a *Natural* and *Civil* person, the difficulty will vanish. God may account us to obey or suffer, or to do that in a *Legal* sense, (namely by *Christ* our *Representative* and *Surety*,) which we did not do in our *own Persons*: and all this without any mistake.

We read in Scripture of God's *not Imputing sin*, where it is, *Psal. 32-2. 2 Cor. 5. 19.* Shall we therefore say, that God is mistaken? Why may not *righteousness* be Imputed to those, who have it not, in their own Persons, inherent in them; as well as *sin* be not Imputed where it is?

Arg. 2. God is no liar, to say we did it, when he knoweth we did it not.

Ans. Were I dealing only with my *Opponent*, (*Mr. Clifford.*) I should be apt to tell him, that more *modest Expressions*, (when we speak of the *Heavenly Majesty*, and Judge of him by our blind sight,) do certainly become us. It is no *lie*, to say a Person doth that in a *Legal* sense, (namely by a *Surety* or *Representative*,) which he doth not in a *Natural* sense, namely in his own Person.

Arg. 3. If we were not the Actors and Sufferers, it is not possible, that we should be made the Natural Subjects of the accidents of anothers body, by any putation, estimation, of mis-judging whatsoever, &c.

Ans. Not to take notice of the word (*putation*,) wherein *Mr. B.* does seem to quarrel with *Imputed righteousness* and with the *Papists*, by way of Reproach to call it *Putative righteousness*, I shall only speak to the argument it self. It is possible for Persons to be the *Legal* Subjects of Anothers actions or sufferings, tho not the *Natural* Subjects of them. Who ever said, that believers were the *Native* or *Natural Subjects* of *Christ's* righteousness. This is to fight with a Man of clouts, of
our

our own making. They are only *Legally*, (or in a Civil and Judicial sense,) reputed to obey and suffer in Christ, all one as a Town or County, that chooseth a *Burgess* to serve in Parliament, is Reputed to do, what the *Burgess* doth in their Name, and so may be said to be the *Legal Subjects* of his actions, tho' 'tis impossible for them to be the *Natural Subjects* of them.

Arg. 4. *It is a Contradiction, and therefore an Impossibility, that the same Individual Actions and Passions, of which Christ's Humane Nature was the Agent and Subject so many Hundred years ago, and have themselves now no existence, should in themselves be made yours now, and you be the Subject of the same accidents. Therefore they can no otherwise be given to us, but by a true estimation of the reasons, why Christ underwent them, (viz. for our sakes,) and by a donation of the Effects or Fruits of them, &c.*

Ans. It is no Contradiction, and no Impossibility, for Persons to be the *Legal Subjects* of anothers actions, and to have anothers Individual actions, Imputed to him in a *Law-sense*; tho' he is not the *Natural Subject* of them. I would fain know the reason, why we cannot be accounted and reckoned *Righteous*, upon the account of anothers *righteousness*, as well as be accounted and reckoned *sinners*, upon the account of anothers *Sin*. Is God more prone to acts of *Justice* and *Severity*, than of *Grace* and *Mercy*? It is evident from the Apostle, that *Adams* sin, (namely that same *Individual Sin*, that he committed,) is Imputed to us; for it is said, we *sinned in him*, and are made *sinners by his disobedience*, Ro. 5. 12, 18, 19. Why therefore may we not be made *Righteous in Christ*, with the *self same righteousness*, that he had, and this also without any *Absurdity*? I see no Contradiction, or Impossibility; either in one or the other.

If any say, that Mr. B. means, that the Contradiction lies in making believers the *Natural Subjects* of Christs actions and righteousness: I would only enquire, against whom does he dispute? I am apt to think, there

are none so foolish, as to assert this. And where is it, that he will allow, that we may be the *Legal*, tho not the *Natural* Subjects of Christ's actions and righteousness? For my part, I cannot discern from Mr. B's Writings, but that he disputes against the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness, *it self*, in any sence, allowing only our participation in the *Effects* of it. And so do his Followers, and particularly my Opponent, (Mr. *Sa. Clifford*,) who makes a great noise, in telling the world, that I have *abused* Mr. B. in saying he differs from the *Assembly of Divines*, particularly in their Doctrine about the *Imputation of Christ's righteousness*, when he himself, in his late Book, (professing to Represent Mr. B's Doctrine,) pretends that their Doctrine is *impossible* and *absurd*.

It is sufficiently evident, that the *Assembly of Divines* did own the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness, *it self*, antecedent to, and as a foundation for the *Effects* of it. But this saith Mr. *Clifford* is impossible, affirming Positively, that no other Persons righteousness can otherwise become *ours*, or be *Imputed* to us, than by the *Effects* and advantages of it. See his *Principles of Christian Religion explained*, p. 136. where he speaks thus.

Christ's Active and Passive obedience is reckoned, accounted and *imputed* to those, who perform the *Conditions* required of them in the Gospel, for their *Benefit*, and *Advantage*; and so is made theirs as to the *benefits* redounding therefrom: but it is not so *Imputed* to them, as if they were Righteous in the sight of God, with the *self same* Active and Passive righteousness, wherewith Christ was Righteous, or as if they had suffered in Christ, or obeyed in Christ, &c. For no other Person's righteousness can otherwise become ours, or be *Imputed* to us, than by the *Effects* and *Advantages*.

To which I reply, this is plain dealing, and puts the matter out of all doubt, that Mr. B. allows not the *Imputation* of Christ's righteousness *it self*, in any sence, notwithstanding Mr. *Clifford* to *blind* the world, and

expose

expose me, does heap up Quotations in his other Book, to make us believe it.

I thought it was the Doctrine of the *Assembly of Divines*, that believers were righteous, with the *self same* righteousness, that was in Christ, his righteousness being Imputed to them. Now saith Mr. Clifford, (quoting Mr. Baxter,) *Christ's righteousness is not so Imputed to believers, as if they were Righteous in the sight of God, with the self same righteousness, wherewith Christ was righteous.*

But then I would ask him, what righteousness of Christ is it, that is Imputed, if it be not the *self same* righteousness, that he had. If *Christ's righteousness* be Imputed to us, as our *Catechism* teacheth, it is the *self same* righteousness that he had, or some other righteousness. Not some other, that he had not, for this would not be his righteousness. And if it be the *same* righteousness, that Christ had, that is imputed: then let any Judge, how well Mr. Clifford does agree with the Doctrine of the *Assembly's Catechism*, notwithstanding all his pretended profession.

For my part, I know no other righteousness of Christ, that is Imputed, or pleaded in this business to be Imputed, but the *self same* righteousness, that he had: only 'tis differently in him, and in us. It is in him, by way of *Inbession*: it is on believers, by way of *Imputation*. It is in him *Naturally*, as the Native Subject of it: it is on believers *Legally*, being accounted theirs for their *Justification*, all one as *Adam's sin* was for their *condemnation*. And therefore tho it is the *same* righteousness, that is Imputed to them that was in Christ; yet they are not as *Righteous* and *Innocent* in God's *esteem*, every way as Christ was: for he was *Righteous Inherently*, they only by *Imputation*, not to mention other differences. There is a great difference between *Adam's sin*, as committed by him, and Imputed to us. We did not destroy the world by that sin, as he did, tho 'tis Imputed to us to our *Condemnation*. So there is a difference between Christ's righteousness, as wrought out by him and Imputed to us, he was the Saviour of the world thereby;

not so we, tho'tis Imputed to us, when we believe in him, to our Justification.

And as to the reason, alledged by Mr. B. and Mr. Cl. (*why the self same righteousness that was in Christ is not Imputed,*) drawn *ab Impossible*, because no Person's righteousness can otherwise become ours, or be Imputed to us, than by the Effects and Advantages; I can't see any force in it. Not to mention Mr. B's opposite Judgment, in his Treatise of Justif. right. p. 108. Where he does allow that in some Cases, anothers Action or righteousness may be made ours, (namely in a moral or Law-sence,) tho we did not Personally perform it. See also his Disput. of Orig. Sin, p. 219. Where he allows the same, concerning the Imputation, or *Reputative Translation* of anothers Fault or Sin, that such a thing is possible in some Cases. Which how Mr. Clifford will reconcile to what he here ascribes to him, I see not. I say, not to insist on this; why can't righteousness be Imputed to us, antecedent to, and as a Foundation for Justification; as well as sin be Imputed to us, antecedent to, and as a Foundation for condemnation? Seeing *Contrariorum eadem est ratio*. We share in the effects of Adam's sin, we are condemned for it, Ro. 5. 18. But is it a Righteous thing with God, to condemn the Innocent? Therefore we say, that his sin also is in some sense ours, (namely in a Legal sense, and by *Reputative Translation*,) which is Antecedent to, and is the Foundation of our condemnation, and here it is, that the Apostle does refer it, Ro. 5. 12. And the like we say in this Case, concerning Christ's righteousness, and our Justification thereupon, and it is the Apostle's own comparison, particularly in that fore-quoted place, Ro. 5. 18, 19.

This for the argument, taken from the Impossibility and absurdity of the thing, which being removed, the Inference thereupon, (*that therefore Christ's righteousness can no otherwise become ours, or be Imputed to us, but in its Effects,*) doth fall of course. Yea I may make this contrary Inference, that seeing it is possible for a Person to be the Legal Subject of anothers action, there-fore

fore that other's Action may be *Imputed* to him, *Antecedent* to the benefit he hath by it.

Arg. 5. If Christ had suffered in our Person *Reputatively* in all respects, his sufferings would not have redeemed us: because we are finite worms, and our suffering for so short a time, would not have been accepted instead of hell sufferings, &c.

Ans. We do not affirm, that Christ suffered in our Person *Reputatively*, in all respects, for he in his suffering was not considered as a mere *Man*, and as a *Private Person*, as we are; but as *God-man*, and as a *Publick person*, which we are not. There is a great deal of difference between a *Publick Representative* and a *Private person*. It does not Follow, that because a *Burgess* in *Parliament* does *Represent* many *Private persons*, that therefore the Actions of those *Private persons*, severally considered, are of so great account, as his. For besides that of a *Private person*, which he hath in *Common* with all the rest, he hath something more, namely that of a *Representative* and *Publick person*, which gives a value to his actions, which the others have not. And to here, tho Christ in suffering *Reputatively Sustained*, the Person of *Sinners*; yet he suffered not as a *Private person*, nor as mere *Man*, and a finite worm: but as a *Publick person*, and as *Mediator God-man*, which was somewhat peculiar unto himself. And therefore his sufferings were *Meritorious* and *Satisfactory*, and so sufficient to redeem us; whom he *Represented* in some parts of his *Mediatorial office*. tho not in all: whereas our own sufferings, being mere *Men*, and *private Persons*, could not have Satisfied God's Justice, or have been effectual unto our Salvation.

Arg. 6. God never made any such Covenant with us, (that he will justify and use us, just as he would have done, if we had our selves, Perfectly obeyed and satisfied.)

Arg. 7. God hath both by his Covenants and Works, ever since confuted that opinion; and hath not dealt with us as he would have done, if we had been the Reputed doers and sufferers of it all our selves. For he hath made con-

veyance of the benefits by a Pardoning or Justifying Law or Covenant, and he inflict: Penalties, &c. all which are inconsistent with that conceit; nor would he so have used us, if we had been Perfectly innocent, and fully Satisfied for our sins, our selves.

Ans. I put these two arguments together, because they tend to the same thing; and the same Answer will serve both. The term (*our selves*) is Equivocal: for we (*our selves*) may be considered in a double respect, *Personally* or *Legally*. Again, we may be considered in this last respect two ways; either according to the tenour of the Covenant of Works, or according to the tenour of the Covenant of Grace.

Now had we Perfectly obeyed and suffered in the first sense, in our own Persons, (*Physically* considered,) as the first Covenant required, and been *Reputed* of God *so to have done*; then God would not have dealt with us, as he doth now, by making *Conveyance* of the blessings promised by a *new Law*, or imposing on us new terms. Neither would he have done so, had we *Perfectly obeyed and suffered*, not in our own Persons, but in a *Surety*, supposing the first Covenant had admitted such a *Surety*; and had ran thus, *either thou shalt obey or die; or else thy surety, in thy room*. But this was not our case. We did not fulfil the Law, in our own Persons; neither did the first Covenant admit of a *Surety*, for this exacted *Personal* obedience; and *Personal* suffering. And therefore seeing God was pleased to *Relax* this first Covenant, and to *dispen*ce with the letter of it, in point of the *Person*, who was to suffer; hence 'twas in his *Power*, and that according to Right and Justice, to impose on us, what reasonable *terms* he saw fit, in order to our being interested in the righteousness of Christ, and the benefits consequent thereunto: and here comes in the *Covenant of Grace*, that we are under, or that Covenant that is made *with us*, in opposition to that other Branch of the Covenant of Grace, that was made *with Christ*, which is commonly called the *Covenant of Redemption*. And hence 'tis, that we are not dealt with, just as if we had Perfectly obeyed in our own Person, so as to have

imme.

immediate Right to Heaven, &c. notwithstanding we are interested in a *Perfect righteousness*, because it is *such a righteousness*, that the *first Covenant* was not bound to accept, on our behalf.

Arg. 8. *All men would have had present Possession of Glory, if God had so Reputed us, the Perfect meriters of it. For his Justice would have no more delayed our reward, than denied it.*

Arg. 9. *All that are saved would have equal Degrees of Holiness and Happiness, as well as of righteousness, because all would equally be Reputed the Perfect fulfillers of the Law. And as no Penalty could ever justly be inflicted on them here, so no Degree of Glory could be denied them hereafter for their Sin, or for want of Perfect righteousness.*

Ans. The former Answer will serve here. Had we fulfilled the Law in our own Persons, and according to the tenour of the *first Covenant*, then we should have had, not only *immediate right to Glory*, but our Happiness would be equal, and no Penalty could justly be inflicted on us: because we should have every way a *Perfect righteousness*, answerable to the Law or *first Covenant*. But this is not our Case. For we have sinned, and come short of the Glory of God; and God hereupon abating the Rigor of the old Law or Covenant, and accepting of a Surety, of his own providing, in our room and stead, has therefore thought fit, to give us a new Law, or Covenant, superadded to the former; wherein he requires new terms, (*Repentance, Faith, Sincere Obedience, and Perseverance,*) on our part, besides what Christ hath done for us; and wherein also he addeth threatenings, and likewise promiseth to reward Persons according to their Works. So that this Doctrine of the Imputation of Christ's righteousness it self, or our being interested in a *Perfect righteousness*, is consistent enough with new Terms and Conditions; with Threatnings and Penalties to be inflicted here; and with different Degrees of Glory hereafter, according to our different Degrees of Holiness.

Arg. 10. The opinion of this kind of Imputation is a most evident Contradiction in its self. For he, that is Imputatively a Satisfier for all his own Sins, as therein supposed to be a sinner: and he that is Imputatively a Perfect fulfiller of the Law, is thereby supposed to need no Satisfaction to Justice for his sin, as being Imputatively no sinner.

Ans. Distinguish of times, and both may agree. He that needs to make Satisfaction for past sin, yet when Satisfaction is fully made, does not then need it.

Again, distinguish between a Natural and Legal Person, and the Contradiction will vanish. He that is a Perfect fulfiller of the Law, in his own Person, needs no Satisfaction, as being no sinner: but he that is only a fulfiller of the Law, in a Legal sense, (namely by a Surety,) and this by Virtue of the Covenant of Grace, may be a sinner, considered in himself, for all that, and as such may need to make Satisfaction. Yea, his needing a Surety to fulfil and satisfy the Law for him, is a plain Argument of his being a sinner; otherwise he would not have needed a Surety. The ambiguity lies in the term (*Imputatively*,) which may be taken in a Natural or Civil sense. And the same distinction will serve for what Follows.

Arg. 11. By this all Christ's Sacrifice and Satisfaction is made a Work of needless Supererogation, yea unjust or rather impossible. For if we Perfectly obeyed in him, he could not suffer for our disobedience.

Ans. If we Perfectly obeyed in him, in a natural sense, according to the tenour of the Covenant of Works, which expressly required Personal obedience, as well as suffering, (which supposition carries in it great absurdity and Contradiction,) then Christ could not suffer for our disobedience, because then we should have no Sin.

But if we Perfectly obeyed in him, not in a Natural, but in a Legal, Civil or judicial sense; and this by Virtue of the Covenant of Grace, which is all we affirm; then he might suffer for our disobedience; for in our selves we might be sinners, tho in him we are Legally, (or rather Evangelically,) Righteous.

Arg. 12. Howby Pardon of Sin is utterly denied: for he that is Reputatively no sinner; hath no Sin to Pardon.

Ans. The Imputation of Christ's Perfect righteousness unto believers, is well consistent with the Doctrine of Pardon, and plainly supposeth that we are sinners; for otherwise we should not need the Imputation of his righteousness to us. Were we indeed Reputed and esteemed, as Perfectly righteous according to the terms of the first Covenant, which required Personal, as well as Perfect obedience, and admitted of no Satisfaction to fulfil it for us; then we should not need Pardon, as having no sin. But this is not our case; we have broken the first Covenant, and are made the righteousness of God in Christ, 2 Cor. 5. 21. And tho Christ's righteousness, wherewith we are Righteous, is a Perfect righteousness; (upon which account the Church is said to be clear as the Sun, in opposition to her own righteousness, in which respect she is fair as the Moon, Can. 6. 10.) Yet God was not bound to provide it for us, nor to accept it on our Account; because the Law, or first Covenant, required of us Personal obedience: and therefore we stand in need of Pardon in this respect. It was pardoning Grace to Relax the Law, or first Covenant. Besides, we have daily need of Pardon, because we are Guilty of daily offences. For tho believers are Righteous in Christ, they are sinners in themselves. And therefore we must distinguish the term, (Reputatively.) He that is Reputatively no sinner in himself, hath no need of Pardon; this we grant: but he that is only Reputatively righteous in Another, and this only by Vertue of the Covenant of Grace, may need Pardon for all that.

[I shall here Transcribe what Mr. Troughton in his *Luth. Red.* Part 2. p. 183, &c. saith to this purpose, who there Answers the like objection.

Obj. If we be justified by God's mercy through the righteousness of Christ, &c. then is there no Proper pardon of Sin: for Christ's righteousness being the Perfect fulfilling of the Law, and we being justified only by applying that righteousness of Christ to us, it seems we shall be account-

not to have fulfilled the Law by our surety, and so not to be chargeable with sin, nor to need Forgiveness.

Ans. We grant, if the Covenant of Works had run thus; that Man should obey and live, and die if he disobeyed, either he or his surety; we grant in this Case, there had been no Proper pardon; but God in Justice would have been bound to have discharged the sinner, when the Surety had Satisfied the Law for him; because it was his own agreement, that either the Principal or the Surety should Satisfie disjunctively; and when there is such an agreement, it is all one to the Creditor, would have been all one to God, which pays the debt, or fulfils the Law: but this is to state the Question for us, and then to dispute against it. We say not, that the first Covenant did allow of a Surety; much less joyned him in the Covenant with Man. Man himself was to obey, or die. But God as the Infinite Sovereign and Law-maker, was pleased to Substitute a Surety to fulfil the Law for him; who as he was not included in the Law; so was there not any particular Covenant in the Law against a Surety. And this supposed, we further Answer;

2. Though Christ fulfilled the Law in Man's stead, and so Life for Man was a Debt to him; yet to Man it is conveyed by true and Proper pardon of Sin: for the Surety was not provided by Man, but by God, who was offended; yea, he was the Son of God, and God himself, and that when no such thing was conditioned and promised, God himself Revealed this Surety to Man, and gives him that Faith, whereby we should have Interest in him, and benefit by him. Now in all this, here is a voluntary Remission of the Punishment due to Sin; a voluntary providing a means of Reconciliation; and at last an Actual reconciliation, discharging Man from Guilt, and taking him into Favour by Faith in Christ, &c.

3. We grant further, that the Justification of a sinner is an Act of Justice, as well as of Mercy. Mercy and Forgiveness as to Him; but Justice as to Christ, who by God's appointment and consent had Satisfied the

' the Law in Man's stead, and therefore it was just and
' due, that they who should be Interested in it, (viz.
' believers,) should be discharged and justified by his o-
' bedience, &c.

I was the more willing to insert the Quotation, be-
cause it is pretended, in Mr. Clifford's defence, that Mr.
B. doth not differ from those Persons, that own Christ
to be a *Consequent Surety*, or a *Representative* by Virtue
of the *Covenant of Grace*; whereas Mr. Traughton did
only plead for Christ's being a Surety or *Representa-*
tive in this sence; and yet he and Mr. B. could not
agree.]

Upon the whole, seeing Mr. B. and Mr. Cl. deny the
Imputation of Christ's righteousness *it self*, and dispute
against it with great earnestness, and allow only the
Donation of it, in its *Effects*; this is an argument, that
they allow not Christ to be a *proper Representative* in any
sence, either by Vertue of the *Covenant of Works*, or
Grace. For if he was a *Proper Representative*, we must
then acknowledge the *Proper Imputation* of his righte-
ousness to us, or the Imputation of his righteousness *it*
self, Antecedent to our sharing in the Effects of it; all
one as we say, that *Adam's sin* is *Imputed* to us, Ante-
cedent to our sharing in the Punishment of it; or that
the Acts and Deeds of *Parliament men*, whilst acting in
the Name of those, they *Represent*, are first *Imputed* to
those Persons that are Represented by them, Antecedent
to their sharing, in those Benefits and Privileges, that
depend on those Acts.

There is a late Author, who hath put forth, (a Plea,
for the late Accurate and Excellent Mr. Baxter, and
those that speak of the Sufferings of Christ, as he does,)
wherein he professeth to Represent Mr. B's. Doctrine.
Now had my Opponent perused this Treatise, it might
have taught him, that Mr. B. denies Christ to be a
Proper Representative, in any sence; for this Author dis-
putes expressly against it.

At p. 57, &c. he hath these words. ' There are
' two things that we have to plead against Christ's thus
' Personating or Representing us; and they are, that such

a Representation of us by Christ, is in differing respects, both too much, and too little to Answer the Exigencies of our Case, and the Scripture account of the matter.

Arg. 1. In some respects, such a *Representative Personating of Sinners* in and by Christ's sufferings, would render them too little to Answer the exigencies of our Case, and the account, which the Scripture gives of them: for if Christ in his sufferings was looked upon as *Properly and most strictly* our Person or Representative, his sufferings would be but the *same thing*, and no more in value or Vertue, than if we our selves had suffered: But if we our selves had suffered as Christ did, would it have been effectual to the great and necessary purposes of obtaining Redemption, reconciliation, Pardon, the Holy Spirit and Eternal Salvation for us? Dares any one say, our own suffering what Christ did, our own dying as he did, would (by way of Merit) have procured such consequent blessings as the Death and Sufferings of Christ did! &c.

Now if Christ died *strictly* in our Person, his Death had signified no more than ours. A Representative, so far as he Represents another, is in Law looked upon no otherwise, than as that other, whom he Represents; whatever excellencies he may otherwise have above that other, yet do they not come under consideration here. As a Representative he does but Personate that other Man; and what he does or suffers as a Representative, is but the *same thing*, as if that other man had done or suffered, &c. Either therefore these benefits were not procured for us by the sufferings of Christ, or he suffered otherwise than as our Representative, &c. To this sence Mr. Baxter had pleaded long since, in the forecited Treatise of *Justifying righteousness*. Part 1. p. 96. If Christ (says he) suffered but in the Person of sinful Man, his sufferings would have been in vain, or no Satisfaction to God, &c. See also *Baxters Life of Faith*, p. 312. Thus therefore such a Representation of us by Christ, would have been too little for us.

Ans.

Ans. Thus then according to this argument, Christ was no *Proper Representative*. And thus this *Author*, sheltering himself under the Name of Mr. D. takes Liberty to expole and Ridicule, the known Doctrine of our *first Reformers*, and the *Reformed Assembly*, and other Divines of Greatest note among us, who all maintained this Doctrine, as hath been shewn in my *Dissertation* and in this *Treatise*. But if this *Author's* arguing be found they all maintained a very *Silly* and *Absurd* Doctrine: and 'tis very strange, that not one among them was *Accurate* enough to observe their Error.

There is a fallacy that runs through the whole Argument: and we must distinguish. *Representatives* are of two Sorts, such as are of a *Publick* capacity, and *Represent many*; and such as act in a *Private* way, and *Represent no more than one*. Now taking a *Representative*, in the last sence, and so I acknowledge, the argument holds good, that a *Representative*, so far as he *Represents another Man*, is in Law looked upon no otherwise, than as that other whom he *Represents*. And consequently what he does as a *Representative*, is but the *same thing*, and no more, than if that other Man had done it. E. G. If I employ my *Servant*, or *Attorney*, or any other *Delegate* that the Law does allow, and *Authorize* and appoint him to pay Money, or to *Transact* for me any other business; why the Law will look on it, all one as if done by my self, and will esteem it the *same thing* and no more, than as if I my self had done it. For in that action he does but barely *Represent* me, and being of *Private* capacity like my self, that which he does in my Name is of no more value, than as if I my self had done it.

But then the case alters as to *Publick Representatives*, who *Personate many*, for these have a sort of value and dignity in their actions, wherein they are the *Representatives* of others, which does not belong to *Private* persons actions. And good reason there is for it: because *vis unitis fortior*. They are, as it were, a *Multitude* in one; many Persons do, in a sence, meet in them; which renders their actions more valuable, than

than the actions of any one *single* person, Represented by them, would be. Thus members in Parliament, who *Represent* others; though the Law *reckons* what they do to all they *Represent*; yet their actions are not the same thing in *value* and no more, than the actions of any one *single* person, Represented by them, would be: because such Persons do Represent a *Multitude* and therefore are more *Honourable*, and Consequently their actions, in the eye of the Law, are of *more value* than those of *Private* persons.

So then according to this *Author's* reasoning, we may undertake to prove to any, (with as good evidence as this *Author* does prove Christ to be no *Proper Representation*,) that *Parliament* men are no *Proper Representatives*: because what they do as the *Representatives* of others, is not the same thing and no more, than if any one *single Private person*, Represented by them, had done it. And if this be the strength of this *Author's* reasoning, (in a Book by his *Party* cried up as *unanswerable*,) I see no reason, that we have to depart, from the old and Common received Doctrine, of Christ's being a *Representative*. For Christ also was a *Publick person*, who Represented many in one.

And besides that, he was *Mediator, God-man*, which gave such a *value* to his sufferings, that can't be ascribed to the sufferings of another. Can any one think, *Dare* any one say, that the sufferings of us, *finite worms*, would be the same thing, as valuable as *Christ's*; because he, as the *Lamb of God*, Represented us in those sufferings, as the *Sacrifices* of old Represented the *officers*? I know, this *Author*, notwithstanding his reasoning thus *inadvertently*, will not *Dare* to say it.

But let us see, whether he acquits himself better in the next *Branch* of his argument, which he continues at, p. 64, 65. in these words.

¶ *Arg. 2.* But again, if the matter be considered under other respects, Christ's strictly Personating, or Representing us in his sufferings, would be no *much* for us. For (as we have before observed) betwixt a *Representative* and that other whom he *Represents*, the Law makes

‘ makes no difference: whatever the Representative does, as a Representative, in the sense of the Law, that other does whom he Represents.’

‘ (1.) If then Christ suffered strictly and properly in the Person of Sinners, or as their Representative, they did in the sense of the Law, suffer themselves; and whatever is the moral effect (i. e. whatever the Law under which Christ suffered has annexed, by Promise, as a consequence,) of his suffering, it being the effect of our Representatives sufferings, may be attributed to us, whom he did therein Represent: whatever is in the Scripture ascribed to the Sufferings of Christ, as an effect of them, if he suffered in our Person, would be ascribed to us: So we should be our own Redeemers, our own Saviours, we should have Merited our own Peace, our own Pardon, &c. as truly as I pay Money, which one that in the strict sense of the Law Represents me, does pay in my Name; or purchase Land, which my Legal Representative purchases for me.

[And thus also does Mr. Baxter argue, in his Treatise of Justif. Right. p. 94. Where, disputing against the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness to self, he hath these words. *It maketh us to have Satisfied Divine Justice for our selves, and Merited Salvation (and all that we receive) for our selves, in and by another: and so that we may plead our own Merits with God for Heaven and all his benefits.*]

Ans. This argument has in it the same Fallacy, as the former: and 'tis just such another argument as this. If Adam sinned as our Representative, then the moral Effects of his sin must be ascribed unto us, whom therein he did Represent; consequently we Merited our own destruction, and so were our own Destroyers; and not only so, but destroyed the world too: for these were the moral Effects of his sin. But who sees not the Invalidity of this kind of arguing?

We must Distinguish, as we did before, between a Publick and Private Representation. If I pay Money, or purchase Land, by my Servant, Attorney, or such a Representative, that the Law does allow, who in that affair

affair does act by my order, and does *Represent* me only; why, the moral Effect of that payment or purchase, may be attributed to me; I may be said in the sense of the Law, to pay the Money or to purchase the Land. And so, if Christ was a *Representative* of our making, employed by us, as our *Delegate* or *Servant*; and as such was allowed by the Father: then we might be said to *Merit* Salvation, and to be our own *Redeemers* and *Saviours*, as well as *Purchasers* in the foregoing instance. But this is not the Case. For Christ as well as Adam was a *Publick Representative*; not of our Constituting, but of God's: and therefore as we did not *destroy* our selves or the world in Adam, so neither do we *save* our selves, or the world in Christ.

As there is a difference, between Adam's disobedience, as committed by him and *Imputed* to us, he sinning as a *Publick person*, on which account it may be said of him properly, that he *destroy'd the world*; which yet cannot be affirmed of us, who sinned in him, only as *members* and by *Imputation*: so there is a difference between the *Suretyship righteousness* of Christ, as considered in him, and as *Imputed* to believers. By virtue thereof he is properly Styled the *Saviour of the World*, and is said to *Merit* Life and Salvation for all that believe. Because it is in him as a *Publick person*, and as the *Native Subject* of it, he wrought it out; which cannot be affirmed of any of his *members*: and therefore tho' it serves them to their own *Justification*, (as the *Imputation* of Adam's sin did to their condemnation,) yet it does not denominate them *Saviours of the World*. Neither does it follow, because this righteousness is *Imputed* to them in such Sort and Proportion as is fit for *Private members*, that therefore they *Merit* Salvation themselves.

(2.) Another absurdity that this Author brings as a Consequence of Christ's being a *Proper Representative* is this, that then we should have an *immediate right* to *Pardon and Glory*. For at, p. 65. he thus argues.

'If Christ had suffered *strictly* in our *Representative* Person, we should have had an *immediate and Absolute Right* to all the proper results and benefits of his sufferings:

' ferings : Indeed if Christ in his own Person, as *Mediator*, purchased these blessings by suffering for us; he may confer 'em on us at what time, in what measure, in what order, and upon what terms he pleases, as we find he does: but supposing him to have been our *Proper Representative* therein, *our Right* in Law to all the benefits of his sufferings, wou'd have been *Absolute*, (as his now is) and have *Immediately* resulted from his having so suffered; so as that no place cou'd have been left for the introducing and imposing upon us any terms or *Conditions* in order to our enjoying such benefits: there could be no room for such a Constitution afterwards, *If thou (Sinner) repent, believe in Christ, &c. thou shalt be saved*: for according to this principle the sinner has *Purchased* Salvation by the Sufferings of Christ (as his *Representative*) he has thereupon an *Absolute* and *Present* right to the Salvation so purchased; to deny to suspend his Right, or withhold him from possession, would be *Injurious* to him, as keeping him from that which is his own, &c. So that this way considered, it does as much exceed, as the other way it *fell short* of answering the exigencies of our case.

Ans. This also is Mr. B's argument in his *Life of Faith*, p. 322. which I have already considered: however, a word briefly now.

We must distinguish of *Publick Representatives*, which are of two Sorts; either according to the tenour of the *Covenant of Works*, or according to the tenour of the *Covenant of Grace*: which is a distinction like that, of Christ's being an *Antecedent* or *Consequent* Surety.

Now had Christ been our *Representative*, according to the tenour of the *Covenant of Works*, then indeed we should have had an absolute and immediate right to *Pardon* and all other proper results and benefits of Christ's sufferings. But Christ was not an *Antecedent Surety*, or a *Representative* by Vertue of the *Covenant of Works*, which knew no *Mediator*: he was only a *Consequent Surety*, and so a *Representative* by Vertue of the *Covenant of Grace*.

nant of Grace. And therefore seeing he was *such a Surety*, and this also of God's *ordaining*, and God's *accepting*, who was not *bound* to accept of such a Surety; hence it was in his *Power*, and that according to the rules of *equity*, to impose on us, what reasonable *terms* he saw fit, in order to our being *Interested* in the *Righteousness* and *Sufferings* of Christ, and the *Benefits* consequent thereupon. And here comes in the *Covenant of Grace*, and new *Terms* and *Conditions*, as I before shew in answer to Mr. B's. 7th. and 8th. *Arguments* against the *Imputation* of Christ's *righteousness*; and thither I shall refer the Reader.

(3.) Another absurdity that attends this Doctrine, (if we may believe this Author,) is this; that then it will follow, *that every sinner would have equal Right, to the forementioned Benefits of Christ's Sufferings.* For an, p. 67. he thus argues.

And we may add, as a farther Consequent hereupon, If Christ had suffered (strictly) as the *Representative Person* of Sinners (Indefinitely as it is expressed) it would follow, that every sinner *Equally* has a Right to the Forementioned Benefits of Christ's Sufferings; why then have not all *Equally* a Pardon? Why, are not the Influences of the Divine Spirit *Equally* diffused? Why are some, (yea even of the truly Sanctified) *more* freed from Sin and Sorrow than others? Some, but *Babes*, whilst others are *strong Men* in Christ? Nay, why are not all in Heaven (whom Christ did *Represent*) as well as some there?

Ans. We must here distinguish as we did before, between a Representative by Vertue of the *Covenant of Works*, and the *Covenant of Grace*. Now Christ being only of the latter Sort, 'tis therefore consistent with God's Justice, to *Dispence* the Purchased blessings of Christ, according to the *Terms* of the new *Covenant*, and in what way he pleaseth. So that this Doctrine of Christ's being a *Proper Representative* is consistent enough with new *Terms*, with different *Degrees* of Grace and Glory, according as Persons comply with those terms. This for substance has been already answered under

Mr.

Mr. B's. 9th. *Argument*, whither I shall refer the Reader.

(4.) The last absurdity that this *Author* mentions as flowing from the Doctrine of Christ's being a *Proper Representative*, we have, p. 67. in these words.

Moreover, if Christ had thus suffered as our *Representative*, (and we had thus Satisfied and Merited in him) what room would there have been left for his *Holiness* and *Obedience* to bestead us, or be of any Advantage to us, &c. What need is there of them, when we have Merited a Pardon, acceptance with God, Eternal Salvation already, by the Sufferings of Christ, as our *Representative*; what farther need can we have of his obeying for us?

Ans. As to our *Meriting* Pardon and Salvation by the Sufferings of Christ, I have spoken already; and shewed that this is *unjustly Imputed* to those that own Christ to be a *Proper Representative*. The Pinch of this objection, (as I apprehend it) lies here: If Christ's Sufferings obtained for us Pardon and Salvation, what need is there of his Obedience? To which I answer, tho Pardon and Salvation are oftentimes ascribed to the Sufferings of Christ, because they have so great a stroke in this business; yet not exclusively of his Obedience. For his Obedience must also be acknowledged to be of great use and Advantage to us: because the Law requires of us Perfect Obedience, in order to have its Promised blessings, as well as Satisfaction for its past Breaches. In order to have Life, we need Pardon, being sinners: and we need a righteousness answerable to the Law. The Law saith, Obey and Live, Transgress and Dye. Now we having Transgressed the Law, are therefore liable unto its Curse: and by the fall being rendred unable to fulfill the Precept, and so to obtain life by it, through the weakness of the flesh, God sent forth his Son, made of a Woman, made under the Law, (both its Precept and Penalty,) that he might Redeem us from the Curse of the Law, and that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, as the Apostle speaks, Ro. 8. 3. 4. Gal. 3. 13. ch. 4. 4. And therefore we conceive, that Christ's Obedience is

L 2

necessary

necessary, as well as his *Sufferings*; and that he *Represented* believers in both.

Besides the *non-Imputation of Sin*, to avoid the curse, there is required a *Positive righteousness* to obtain the blessing. Which is Illustrated in that Representation of the Justification of a sinner before God, of which we read, *Zeck. 3. 4.* Where the taking away of the *filthy garments*, (or the Pardon of Sin through Christ's blood,) is distinguished from the cloathing us with *change of Raiment*, (namely the Robes of Christ's Obedience and Righteousness.) By the one we are freed from *Condemnation*, (and so are brought to that state which we had at first, which was a state of trial;) and by the other we have Right unto *Life and Salvation*, (as having that righteousness which the Law does require, its Rigour being abated in the change of the Person :) and we come to be *interested* in both, by complying with Gospel terms.

Thus those, that own Christ to be a *Proper Representative*, do plead for the necessity of his *Obedience and Holiness*, as well as his *Sufferings*; and do say that Christ *Represented* us in both. Which is more than this *Author* will allow. For he by no means will allow Christ to *Represent* us in his *Obedience*. For at, p. 51, 52, &c. he speaks thus.

' We should carefully distinguish betwixt Christ's
' *Representing* us in his *Sufferings*, and *Representing* us
' in his *Obedience*, &c. He did not so far *Represent* or
' *Personate* sinners, in his *Holiness* and *Obedience*, as in
' his *Sufferings*. It is (as we shall immediately shew,)
' in some sence allowable to say, Christ *suffered* in the
' *Person* of a *Sinner*, or *Sinners*; but I know no sence,
' in which it may be said, that he *obeyed* in the *Person*
' of a *Sinner* or *Sinners*. He did not *Personate* a *Sinner*
' much less *Sinners*, in his sinless obedience; this were
' as grossly absurd (as Mr. Baxter himself hints, in his
' *Treatise of Justif. right.* Part 1st. p. 58.) as it would
' be to say, *In the Person of Sinners, he never sinned.*
' Now this we the rather take notice of, because this
' *Accuser* extends Christ's personating us *Indifferently*

and equally, to both his obedience and suffering. For thus he speaks in his late *Defence*, p. 28. *Christ's thus suffering and obeying in the Person of Sinners, it is to all Intents and Purposes as Effectual, as if they did it themselves.* And what any *Libertine* or *Antinomian* would say more than this, I know not; or which way he will, or can, make this consist with the Necessity of Faith and Repentance, in order to our actual discharge from Punishment, I cannot imagine.

Ans. I shall only make a few Remarks, on this Quotation, and so for the Present dismiss this *Author*.

1. I cannot but take notice of that Name that this *Author* gives to Mr. L. whom very frequently, and on all occasions, he calls this *Accuser*. In some places you have it no less than three times in one Page. The expression, I confess was offensive to me, to see it so often reiterated in the Book, because it is the *Devil's* character, who *iniquatus* is styled in Scripture, the *Accuser of the Brethren*, Rev. 12. 10. I am apt to believe, that this *Author* is somewhat akin to that *Gentleman*, who wrote the Preface to Mr. Clifford's *Scurrilous Pamphlet*, Published on purpose to expose me: where it is suggested, that I also was the *Devil's Instrument*, in Writing what I did against Mr. B. This is one part of that *Apology*, he makes for publishing that Book, viz. *That if Satan by the Hand or Tongue of any one, (tho a Good-man,) misrepresent him or his Writings, &c. what can be more becoming a friend, than to wipe off the Reproach, &c.* But to let that pass.

2. Another thing that I would remark in the above Quotation, is this *Author's* opinion concerning our Saviour's Representing sinners in his Obedience, which he exposeth as *Absurd* and *Ridiculous*, bringing Mr. B. to confirm what he saith. Whereas in my apprehension, there is no such *Absurdity* in this Doctrine, as is pretended. For as I conceive it, the Case was this. The Law required Obedience and Suffering. Before the fall obedience only was required of us, in order to have the life Promised: but since the fall, obedience and suffering were both necessary. So that we owed a double Debt

unto God, a Debt of *Active* and *Passive* obedience, which we of our selves were not able to pay. Christ therefore steps in, as a *Representative* and *Surety* and paid both these debts in our room and place. Accordingly we read, that we have *Forgiveness through his blood*, Eph. 1. 7. And that we are made *Righteous to Justification of life, through his Obedience*, Ro. 5. 18, 19. It is by *his Obedience* that we are made *Righteous*. But how *his Obedience* could be made *ours*, or imputed to us, if in that obedience, he did not *Represent* us, I do not understand.

What tho it sounds like a *Contradiction*, to say that *Christ in his sinless obedience Represented sinners*: yet it is not, whilst the opposition does not respect the *same* thing. Tho Christ in himself *knew no sin*, yet in a sence he was made *sin*, as the Apostle tells us, 2 Cor. 5. ult. He was *Imputatively* a sinner, he was *Juridically* and *Substitutively* *Guilty*, upon his undertaking to be our *Sponsor*; tho he was *Personally* *Innocent*, *Inherently* *sinless*. (See Mr. Carnock, Vol. 2. p. 310.) And so here, tho Christ himself *never sinned*, yet he might stand in the *Room* of sinners, in order to *obey the Law* for them, which they since the fall could not do; as well as to *bear their deserved Punishment*, for their past *Transgression*. In his *Sufferings* he *Represented* us as *Sinners*; in *Obedience* he *Represented* us as *Men*, who were sinners: and what absurdity in all this? A *Surety* may pay anothers Debt, in his *Name*, and as his *Representative*, tho he himself might never have any *Debt of his own*.

3. Another thing that I have to remark, is this *Authors* reflecting on Mr. L. as an *Antinomian*, only for extending Christ's *Personating* of sinners to his *Obedience* as well as *Sufferings*, and saying it was to *all intents and Purposes* as *Effectual*, as if they had done it themselves.

But what is the difference between this expression and that of Bishop *Ushers* in his *Body of Divinity*, p. 194. Where he tells us, 'That the righteousness of Christ, whereby a sinner is justified, is the *Perfect Obedience*,

‘*dience*, which in his Humane Nature of ours, he performed unto the *whole Law* of God, both by *doing* whatsoever was required of us, *Mat. 3. 15.* and by *suffering* whatsoever was deserved by our sin, *1 Pet. 2. 24.* &c. And that which makes this righteousness of Christ so really *ours*, that it doth *justify* us, is the Gracious *Imputation* of God the Father, accounting his Son’s righteousness unto the sinner, and by that accounting making it his to all effects, as if he himself had performed it.

Here Bishop *Usher* does extend Christ’s personating us to his *Obedience* as well as *suffering*; and tells us that both are imputed to us, to all effects, as if we our selves had performed it.

And if I mistake not the *Westminster Assembly* in their *Confession* are of the same opinion. For chap. 11. §. 1. They speak of the *Imputation* of Christ’s *Obedience*, as well as *Satisfaction*. And *Imputation* in the sense they field it, is grounded on the Doctrine of *Representation*.

The *Church of England*, in her *Homilies*, does also maintain the *Imputation* of Christ’s *Obedience*, as well as *Suffering*. For in the *Sermon of Man’s Salvation*, there are these words, p. 13.

‘God sent his Son, our Saviour Christ into the world, to fulfil the *Law* for us, and by shedding his most precious blood to make *Satisfaction*, &c. to his Father for our sins, to assuage his wrath and indignation conceived against us for the same.

Again, p. 14. ‘Who (i.e. *Christ*,) besides his ransom fulfilled the *Law* for us Perfectly, &c. Again, p. 15. ‘So that Christ is now the righteousness of all them that truly believe in him, he for them paid the ransom by his *Death*, he for them fulfilled the *Law* in his *Life*. ‘So that now in him and by him, every true Christian man may be called a *fulfiller* of the *Law*, &c.

So that the *Homilies* plainly teach, that we may be said, to have *obeyed* and *suffered*, in what Christ hath done and suffered for us.

Of the same Judgment is Mr. *Perkin's* in his *Commentary* on Gal. 2. 16. p. 118. Where he speaks thus. 'It may be demanded, what is that thing in Christ, by and for which we are justified. I answer, the *Obedience of Christ*, Ro. 5. 19. And it stands in two things, his *Passion in Life and Death*, and his *fulfilling of the Law*, joyned therewith. For by Faith the Law is established, Ro. 3. 31. Christ was sent in the *Similitude of sinful flesh*, that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, Ro. 8. 4. And Christ is the Perfection of the Law for righteousness to all that believe, Ro. 10. 4. He that doth not fulfil all things contained in the Law is Accursed, Gal. 3. 10. seeing therefore we cannot perform the things contained therein, by our selves, we must perform them in the Person of our Mediator: who hath satisfied for the Threatnings of the Law by his *Passion*, and hath fulfilled the Precepts of the Law by his *Obedience*, in all Duties of Love to God and Man. We owe to God a double Debt. One is, that we are to fulfil the Law every Moment, from our first beginning, both in regard of Purity of Nature, and Purity of Action. And this Debt was laid upon us in the Creation, and is Exacted of us in the Law of God. The Second debt is a Satisfaction for the Breach of the Law. For this double debt Christ is become our Surety, and God accepts his Obedience for us, &c.

Mr. *Clarkson* also, in his Vol. of *Sermons*, p. 222. speaks much the same as Mr. L. does; his words are these. 'Christ is a Publick person as Adam was, Represents those that are his, as Adam did; and what he doth or suffers in their stead, the Lord accepts it, as if they had done or suffered it.

Mr. *Troughton* in his *Luth. Red.* Part 2. p. 24, &c. explaining and stating this point, the Imputation of Christ's righteousness, hath these words.

The righteousness of Christ, which we say is Imputed to a sinner for his Justification, is that righteousness which he fulfilled and wrought in conformity to the Law of God, whereby the Law violated by us, was fulfilled and satisfied for us, and in our stead. Ro. 10. 4. Christ

Christ is the End of the Law for righteousness, to every one, that believeth. Therefore it is not the righteousness of his *Divine person*, which is imputed to us; for that is *infinite*, such as men are *incapable* of, &c.

Christ's righteousness then, which is imputed to us, is his Holy Life in *Obedience* to the Law of God, and his voluntary *obediential suffering* the Penalties of the Law, unto Death it self, for us and in our stead. By the *latter* he made *Satisfaction* for our sins, and breach of the Law; and by the *former* he *fulfilled the Law* in the proper and principal design of it, and thereby purchased eternal life, which was Promised by the Law to them that fulfil it; &c.

Now when we say, this righteousness of Christ is *Imputed* to believers, reckoned or accounted theirs, *Ro. 4. 3.* *Ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ οἱ δικαιώματά του.* we do not mean, that God looketh upon them, as if they had done and suffered in their *own Persons*, what Christ did in his, in any proper sense. For Christ only is accounted the *Author* of his own righteousness, and tho' believers be justified by it, yet the Honour of *working* that righteousness and of being the proper Subject of its *Inherence* belongeth to Christ alone. But by *Imputation* we mean, that God *accounteth* the righteousness of Christ to have been wrought by him for every one, that believeth, and doth justify or accept them to Life eternal, for that *very righteousness* believed or trusted in, according to the Promise of the Gospel, &c.

This is that which our *Divines* mean by saying Christ's righteousness is *ours in Law*, that Christ and a believer are *one in Law*, viz. that the Law of God is as truly and fully *satisfied* for us, by the righteousness of Christ, as if we had fulfilled it *our selves*; and that God being pleased to admit of the *fulfilling* of the Law by Christ for us, the Law doth pronounce us *Righteous* and heirs of Life, for that *righteousness*, which Christ wrought in obedience to it.

And if this be the common sense of our *Divines*, I see not but they say as much as Mr. L.

Dr. Tho

Dr. Tho. Goodwin in his *Triumph of Faith*, p. 88. hath these words.

Christ was considered and appointed of God, as a *Common Person*, both in what he *did*, and in what was *done* to him: so as by the same Law, what he did for us is reckoned or imputed to us, as if we our selves had *done* it; and what was done to him, tending to our Justification and Salvation, is reckoned as done to us.

I might also mention Dr. Owen, (whom Mr. B. himself censured, as a *Subverter* of the Gospel, for the like expression, as I before noted,) and many other *eminent Divines*, who express themselves much after the same manner; not to speak of our *First Reformers*. But saith this *Author*, *What any Libertine or Antinomian would say more than this, I know not.*

So then, according to this *Author* the *Church of England*, and the *Westminster Assembly*, Mr. Perkins, Bishop Usher, and some of the *Greatest Divines* we have, (together with Mr. L.) are a company of *Antinomians*.

Mr. B. has broken the Ice: and now 'tis easy for others to Follow. But by the way, this Gentleman gives us a good specimen of his great Moderation, of which he had talked so much in his *Preface*, to bring Persons to a good liking of his new *Notions*, tho he can't forbear, in that very Treatise, to *Censure* their Doctrine.

And thus this Gentleman, does himself confirm, what I spake in my *Preface* by way of fear and foresight, that if once this Party does get Head, all those that keep to the *Assembly's Doctrine*, would in short time be accounted *Antinomians*.

But saith this *Author*, if so be we admit of that principle, which way we can make it to consist, with the necessity of Faith and Repentance, he cannot Imagine.

Ans. I am sorry, that this *Authors Imagination*, which is so Quick in other things, should be so dull here. We must distinguish between the Covenant, made with Christ,

Christ, (commonly called the *Covenant of Redemption*;) and that *Covenant* that is made with us, commonly called the *Covenant of Grace*. That which *Christ* undertook in the *Covenant of Redemption*, was to make Satisfaction to God for Man's sin, to fulfill the Law of Works in our place, both as to its *Penal* and *Preceptive* part; that so we might have a *righteousness*, to free us from *Death*, and also to give us a *Right to Life*. And this *righteousness*, when we come to be interested in it, is as *Effectual* to these Ends, as if we had performed it ourselves. But then in order to be interested in it, God in the Gospel requires of us *Faith* and *Repentance*, which are the terms on our part. God might impose on us what terms he pleased in order to our being interested in this *righteousness* of *Christ*, (his *Active* and *Passive Obedience*;) because *Christ* was a *Surety* of his own *Providing*, and which he was not bound to accept, not being *Originally* in our bond. Now these terms are set down in the Gospel, or in that *Covenant* that is made with us; and here we are instructed in the absolute *Necessity* of *Faith* [and *Repentance* on our part, in order to be interested in this *Righteousness* of *Christ*.

Thus then according to this Doctrine, we establish the necessity of Gospel Conditions, on our part, in order to be interested in *Christ's* *righteousness*; which when we are, it is as *effectual* to all intents and purposes, or to all Effects, (as the Right Reverend Bishop *Usher* expresseth it,) as if we had performed it our selves. And at the same time, we also establish *Christ's* *righteousness* in *Justification*, (the Imputation of *Christ's* *righteousness* it self;) and do Glory in him, as the Lord our *righteousness* as the Church of Old did, *Jer.* 23. 6. *Isai.* 45. 24. Agreeable whereto are those Scriptures in the new Testament, *Ro.* 5. 18, 19. *2 Cor.* 5. 21. Esteeming our own *righteousness*, in point of Dependence for Justification, (any farther than 'tis our *Declarative* Justifying *righteousness*, and the way and means of God's appointment, in order to be interested in *Christ's* *righteousness*,) but as filthy Rags, as Dung and Dross, to make use of Scripture expressions, *Isai.* 64. 6. *Phil.* 3. 8. Desiring to be
found

found in Christ and his righteousness, not having on our own righteousness which is of the Law, but that which is through the Faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith, v. 9.

Had this Author been acquainted with Mr. Perkins works, he would have shewn him; that tho Christ obeyed as well as suffered for us, as our Surety and Representative, yet our own obedience is not needless: for he speaks to this objection, particularly in his Comment, upon the Galatians, p. (*mibi*) 121. His words are these.

Thus we see, what the Obedience of Christ is. And here two Errors must be avoided. The one is of some Protestants, less Dangerous, yet *anathema*; namely that we are justified only by the Passion of Christ. But if this were so, we should be justified without fulfilling the Law. For (as I have said) we owe to God a double debt: one by Creation, namely the fulfilling of the Law in all things, from our first beginning; the second since the fall of Adam, namely a Satisfaction for the breach of the Law. Now the Passion of Christ is a payment of the Second debt, but not of the first: whereas both must be answered. For *curst* is he that doth not continue in all things written in the Law to do them. The passion of Christ procureth deliverance from Hell; but alone by it self considered, it doth not purchase a Right to Eternal Life.

Object. 1. Christ fulfilled the Law for himself; and therefore his passion alone serves for our Justification.

Ans. Christ as Man fulfilled the Law for himself; that he might be in both Natures a holy High-Priest, and so continue. Nevertheless, as Mediator, God-man, he became Subject to the Law: in this regard he did not fulfil the Law for himself, neither was he bound so to do.

Object. 2. That which Christ did, we are not bound to do: but Christ (say some) fulfilled the Law for

‘ for us: therefore we are not bound to fulfil the Law.’

‘ *Ans.* That which Christ did, we are not bound to do, for the *same End*, and in the same manner. Now he fulfilled the Law in way of Redemption and Satisfaction for us, and so do not we fulfil the Law, but only in way of *thankfulness* for our Redemption, &c. So far he.

Thus having removed this *Author's* objections, I think we may conclude (notwithstanding his contrary conclusion at, p. 69.) that Christ was a *Proper Representative*.

Now this *Author*, professing to explain Mr. B's Doctrine, had my Opponent perused his *Treatise*, this also might have shewn him, that Mr. B. does not own Christ to be a *Proper Representative* in any sence.

So then this *first Suggestion* is untrue; I am not bound if I would dispute against Mr. B. to prove, that Christ was included in the first Covenant: for he denies him to be a *Proper Representative* in any sence; either by Virtue of the Covenant of Works, or Grace.

2. He suggests, that I my self pretend to undertake it, namely, to prove Christ an Antecedent Surety, or a Legal Representative according to the terms of the first Covenant. To which I answer, it is no such thing. I never dreamt of any such thing in my whole Disputation; and do expressly explain my self quite otherwise, as any may see, who will but read my own words, in my explication of the state of the Question, p. 422. Where I speak thus; We owed to God a Debt of Active and Passive obedience, which we our selves could never pay. Christ in our Name, as our Sponsor and Surety, hath undertaken to pay these Debts, for all those that believe in him; which undertaking of Christ is accepted by the Father. If therefore the Law threaten us with Death, for non-payment of our Debts, if so be we believe in Jesus Christ, we may plead we have paid them by Christ, our Surety. Not according to the strict Rigour of the Law, which requires Personal payment; but according to the Grace of the Gospel, God having of his free Grace accep-
ted

ted Payment from a surety, from one that undertook to do it in our room. Now this sort of payment being such that God might have refused; 'tis therefore consistent enough with it, to have Terms and Conditions proposed to us in order to our being interested in it, namely such as we find in the Gospel.

Now what person, (besides this Author, who also runs into the same fault, he would fasten on me, of misrepresenting other mens Writings,) would ever apprehend from these words of mine, that I plead for Christ's being a Legal Representative according to the terms of the first Covenant, when I say expressly, our payment by Christ is not according to the strict rigour of the Law, which required Personal payment, but according to the Grace of the Gospel. And moreover add, that this sort of payment was *quid recusabile*, such as God might refuse; whereby it appears, that I plead only for Christ's being a Consequent Surety, such as the Law or first Covenant was not bound to accept; and so was a surety and Representative by Vertue of the Covenant of Grace only. I also explain my self again to this purpose, p. 425. Where I speak thus; *A proper Debt may be said to be discharged in a Law sence two ways; either according to the terms of the Covenant of Works, which required Personal payment; or according to the terms of the Covenant of Grace, which admits a surety in the room of a believer. Where the proper Debt is discharged in a Law sence, according to the terms of the Covenant of Works, I grant there is no room for Pardon; such an one oweth nothing. But where 'tis only discharged sensu legali vel civili, in a Law sence according to the terms of the Covenant of Grace, which admits of a surety in the room of believers; that here is no room for Pardon, I deny. For such an one is abated the rigour and strictness of the first Covenant, which God was not bound to do. What words could be fuller to obviate the suggestion of this Author, who, right or wrong, will tell the world, that I pretend to undertake to prove, that Christ was a Legal Representative according to the terms of the first Covenant, whereas I profess in more places than one to do quite otherwise.*

Had

Had I been guilty of so gross a mistake, in misrepresenting Mr. B's. Writings in any particular, as this Author has mine, no doubt it would not be let pass without a particular aggravation; yea we have had some trial of it, when no just ground has been given; but I delight not in throwing dirt, I seek after truth.

The only thing that I pretend and profess to prove in my *Disputation* is that Christ was a *Legal Representative* according to the terms of the Covenant of Grace; and so was *Tabula post naufragium*, a plank after our shipwreck, who stept in for our help after the fall. The first Covenant, or the Covenant of Works had no surety. The Ingenious Author of the *Plea for those that speak of Christ's sufferings*, as Mr. B. does, has very excellently and solidly proved, that Christ was no *Antecedent surety*; that he was not included in the first Covenant; a truth that no Body does deny, that I know of. But tho he was not an *Antecedent surety*, or a *Legal Representative* by Vertue of the first Covenant, yet it does not follow that he might not be a *Consequent one*, or a *Legal Representative* according to the tenour of the Covenant of Grace. For I do not understand, that 'tis absolutely necessary to the being of a *Surety* or a *Legal Representative*, that he must be so constituted before a Person has need of him. But if when we have need of him, the Creditor himself will provide a *surety*, or one will step in as a *surety* and *Representative*, to stand in our room, bear our Punishment or pay our Debts: here is a *strict, Proper, Legal Representative*, if the Rector or Creditor accept of him, tho he were not Originally in our bond, so as to be included in the first Covenant. And this I take to be much the case between God the Father, Christ and us, upon Man's fall. This Author therefore does grossly abused me, to say that I pretend to prove that, which to any that shall look into my *Disputation* does appear quite otherwise.

This Author has given us sufficient trial of his great Judgment in applying Quotations to matter of Fact; and now as the close before we part, he will for once, in one general Remark give us some taste of his skill in disputing,

disputing, as to matter, of *Doctrine*. But if this be this *Author's* skill in *disputing*, to confound a plain Question by *false suggestions*, and then to cry out he has smote his adversary *Hip and Thigh*; he may (if he please) go on in his *Triumph*, I shall not molest him.

3. Lastly, he does also suggest, that when I find my self pincked, he finds me changing my *Legal Representative*, into a *Representative by Vertue of the Covenant of Grace*. What stuff is this? Where did I ever pretend to prove, that Christ was any other than a *Legal Representative by Vertue of the Covenant of Grace*? But it seems the word *Legal* is a hard term. This *Author* thinks, that when ever 'tis mentioned, it has always respect to the *Covenant of Works*. Whereas Mr. B. does use it otherwise, as it appears from his explication, understanding by *Legaliter* nothing else but *Civiliter*, *Univ. Red.* p. 67. So in a like proposition, where he denies Christ to be a *Representative*, he explains himself in what sence he intends it, namely *sensu legali vel civili*. And so in his *End of Doctrinal controu.* p. 260. he there explains his *Legal Person* by a *Civil Person*. The like he doth in his *Life of Faith*, p. 310. and in other places. And I also in my *Disputation* do take *Legal* in the same sence; not as opposed to *Evangelical*, but as opposed to *Natural*; and so by a *Legal Representative* I understand a *Representative in a Law-sence*, in a *Civil, Judicial or Juridical sence*, as is plain from my own words, p. 424, 427, 435, 436, 443, &c. And when I apply it unto Christ, and speak of him as a *Legal Representative*, I explain my self expressly that he was so only according to the tenour of the *Covenant of Grace*, p. 425, 431, 432, 443, 446, &c. And to this sence I keep, without changing the state of the Question. And therefore this suggestion is wholly groundless.

So that not one of these notable suggestions, whereof this general Remark does consist, does hold true. And therefore those Inferences built on them, that I speak *non-sence*, and oppose no Body, or hurt none but my self, deserve no answer. For if the *Foundation* be Removed, the *Superstructure* will fall of course.

On

Only I cannot but take notice of that handsome *Treatment*, this *Author* at parting is pleased to give me, in telling the world, that I speak *non-sence*, I could Retaliate, but will not. Only this in the *General*, It is my observation that the men of his *Kidney*, thus beget-
ted to that party, are *Monopolizers* of all knowledge in their own *conceits*: and no doubt, they are the men, and *Wisdom shall die with them*.

CONCLUSION.

§. 6. **H**AVING vindicated my self from the groundless aspersions, and unjust Reflections of Mr. *Sa. Clifford*. who has not made good one charge against me; it remains now, that I speak somewhat of the late Reverend Mr. *Baxter*, that so none may abuse what I have spoken to a wrong end.

'Twas not my design in my *Disputation* to bring Persons out of love with Mr. *B's* Writings, (for I there acknowledge, that the world is much beholden to his useful labours,) but to consider some Points of Doctrine, wherein I conceive that Mr. *B.* differs from the Common Doctrine received among us; which being obtruded in some places under his Name, has given occasion to strife and discord.

With all my heart, Mr. *B.* shall be as great, as any would have him, so it be not from an ill design, and so they keep within modest bounds. But when Persons cry up Mr. *B.* above all other men, the better to propagate some new Doctrine, and so throw a bone of contention among us; and speak of him as is unbecoming the Christian profession, making Comparisons between him and our Saviour Christ, and say of him, (as it is Reported of one of the club, that was contained in Mr. *Cl's* Defence,) that Mr. *B.* understood Metaphysics better than Jesus Christ himself: this is not to be endured, and such Persons deserve some check.

When all is said, that can be spoken of Mr. *B.* we must at last own him to be a Man, and so Subject to error in some things, as well as other men. And this
M Being

being granted, surely it is not an *unpardonable crime* to *Examine* some of Mr. B's. Writings. We have a rule, *Amicus Plato, Amicus Aristoteles, at magis Amica Veritas*. Tho' Mr. B. was a great Man, and a good Friend to the Christian cause, yet if Mr. B. does erre from the truth in any considerable *Point* of Doctrine, we may take liberty in that respect to *dissent* from him, and shew our *Publick* dislike of it, that others may not be insinared into *Error*, from that respect they bear to him. And all this without any danger of rendring the labours of this *Excellent* Divine useless to the world: for when we have all *one face*. then shall we be in all points of *one mind*; we must chuse the good and refuse the *Evil*; the best of men in this world have their *Errours* and failings.

The Reverend Mr. B. has done much good Service against the *Antinomians*, whose Doctrine does justly deserve to be *abhorred* of all good men. And therefore Mr. B. (as all must acknowledge) has *well deserved* on that account; not to speak of other his *useful* Writings. But some think, that Mr. B. in his vehement opposition unto the *Antinomians*, is gone himself into some *Extream*, (which is not impossible,) and so is fallen in with the *Arminian* Doctrine, in that point about *Justification*; which being obtruded in some places, to the *disturbance* of the Churches quiet, gave occasion to my *Disputation*, wherein I endeavour to defend the *Common* received Doctrine in opposition to the *Antinomians*, and without runing into the *Arminian* quarters.

Mr. B. was a man as much *professedly* for Peace, as any in the world. In his *Apology* prefixed to his *Infant Church membership*, he hath these words; I can truly say, and without vanity, that the chiefest study of my Life is the Churches Peace. He has wrote more for Peace and Concord than any man living, that I know of. It is his earnest Prayer at the End of his *Confession of Faith*, p. 462. That the Name of a Party or Faction may be as *hateful*, as the Name of a Drunkard or a Whoremonger. And yet 'tis unhappily fallen out, through the intemperate zeal of some, that this Great and Good-man is him-

self become the *Head of a Party*, who begin to be called after his *Name*, to the *Scandal of Religion*, and the *grief of the Godly*; it being that which was *blamed of Old* in the *Apostle's* time, for one to be of *Paul*, and another of *Apollus*, 2 Cor. i. 12. Christians are crumbled and divided into *Parties* enough already; 'tis great *Pity*, there should be any more.

At present we unite in the *Assembly's Catechism*: let us keep to that *Doctrine*, and observe the *Apostle's* rule, Rom. 14. 22. and not *disturb* the *Peace of the Church* with our *Faith*, or particular persuasion.

We plead *Possession*. We are in possession of the *Assemblies Doctrine*, it being generally received in the three kingdoms: and therefore can't *justly* be blamed by any, for *defending* our hold, whilst agreeable to *Scripture*; they are the *Aggressors*, that would drive us from it. Mr. B. himself in his *Confession of Faith*, p. 14. does own this *Catechism* to be the best that he ever yet saw. Why then cannot we live in the quiet enjoyment of this *Doctrine*? Why must we be blamed, and called *Antinomians*, that keep close to it, and hold in particular, that Christ was a *Legal Representative*, and the *Imputation* of his righteousness in the *Proper* sense, and *Justification* by Faith considered *Relatively* and *Instrumentally*?

If any say, that the whole controversy is but a *Logomachy*. To me it does not appear so. I suppose I have shewn in the foregoing *Treatise*, that in some points there is a *Real* difference. Yet grant it were so, that 'tis but a *Logomachy*; I think then that those who would obtrude their *new way* of explaining things, giving *hard Names* to those that keep to the *Old* explanation, which in their apprehension is the *better* of the two, are the more to *blame*; for causing strife about *words*, when in *substance* we are agreed.

To heal our *Breaches*, as well as to maintain the *truth* of the *Gospel*, was what I proposed in my *Dispensation*. Wherein (with young *Elisha*) I have adventured to *interpose* my *Judgment*. And if I fail of my desired end, yet 'tis some comfort, that *In magnis vo-*

luisse sat est. The Method I have taken has been by opposing all Parties, and by a Reconciling explication of Doctrine. The great thing, that the Reverend Mr. B. aimed at in opposing the Antinomians, was to establish Gospel Conditions. This I have done, notwithstanding I maintain the Federal Headship of Christ and Adam.

I am well satisfied my aim was good, and have no reason to Repent of that, to which I am again called by my Opponent in the close of his Book, as I was by Mr. R. at the beginning. I know I have displeased many of my Friends, for offering to meddle with Mr. B. but the Reasons hereof I have mentioned in the Preface. If so be I was sensible that I had any way wronged that Excellent Divine, by Misrepresenting his Writings to the world, which Mr. Clifford does lay to my charge, I hope I should be ready, to give all the Publick Satisfaction I could.

That Mr. Clifford has abused me, I suppose is Evident from this Treatise. However, having wiped off the Dirt and Reproach of this Brother, I shall put it up. From that acquaintance I have with him, I believe Mr. C. to be a good Man, (tho I do not commend his Precipitant Zeal,) and shall be ready to maintain all Christian communion with him, as in times past.

I should heartily be glad, it here were an end of these Personal contests. May the God of Peace Heal our breaches, and direct us into Truth and Peace!

FINIS.

THE CONTENTS.

SECT. I.

- C**oncerning Mr. B's new Scheme of Divinity; and
wherein it differs from the 39 Articles, and the As-
semblies Confession and Catechism, Page 1.
A like observation of Mr. J. Troughton in his *Luthe-*
rus Redivivus, p. 7.
Mr. Clifford's reflection for answering Mr. B. when he
was dead, very disingenuous, p. 10.
As also his Reflection of a long Beard, p. *ibid.*

SECT. II.

- Concerning the Imputation of Adam's Sin, and his Fede-
ral Headship, p. 12.
In what sense Mr. B. denies the Imputation of Adam's
Sin, p. *ibid.*
Mr. B. establisheth the Imputation of Adam's sin on no o-
ther Foundations, but what will equally establish the
Imputation of nearest Parents sins, p. 13.
Mr. B. denies Adam to be a Federal Head, in the sense
that our other Divines understand it, p. 15.

SECT. III.

- Concerning the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, p. 25.
Mr. B. quarrels both with Name and Thing, p. *ibid.*
An observation of Mr. J. Troughton declaring the arts,
whereby some late Authors propagate their new Doctrine,
p. 27.
And

The Contents.

<i>And the reasons, why they keep the Orthodox terms,</i>	p. 36.
<i>Mr. Troughton's Reply to Mr. B's answer to Dr. Tully, wherein Mr. B. complains of being wronged, for being charged with the Denial of the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness,</i>	p. 37.
<i>Mr. B's reflecting on Dr. Owen, as maintaining the subverting sense, &c.</i>	p. 40.
<i>The Controversy about Imputed Righteousness is more than verbal,</i>	p. 41.

S E C T. IV.

<i>Concerning the place of Faith and Works in Justification, In what sense Mr. B. makes Faith and Obedience to be one,</i>	p. 42.
<i>An observation of Mr. Benj. Jenks shewing that our late Authors go off from the Doctrine of the Church of England,</i>	p. 43, 51, &c.
<i>Mr. B's notion of Justifying Faith, and how distinguished from obedience,</i>	p. 48, 51, 63, 67, 90, 96, 104.
<i>Remarks on Mr. B's Aphorisms of Justification,</i>	p. 49.
<i>Mr. B's notion of a Double Justification, Legal and Evangelical,</i>	p. 50, 53, 55, 65, 71, 87.
<i>His opposing the notion of Faith's being an Instrument,</i>	p. 51, 57, 75, 97.
<i>His pleading for Justification by Obedience as well as Faith,</i>	p. 51, 55, 66, &c.
<i>His not opposing Faith to Gospel Works,</i>	p. 52, 64, 70, 87, 89, 96.
<i>His making Faith and Obedience to have the same kind of causality in Justification,</i>	p. 52, 65, &c.
<i>Remarks on Mr. B's Four Disputations about Justification,</i>	p. 55.
<i>In what sense Repentance and Obedience may be said to be Conditions of Justification,</i>	p. 56, 66.
<i>Of the distinction Fides quæ & fides quâ, and the ground of it,</i>	p. 57, 77.
<i>Of the Instrumentality of Faith in Justification, and how it makes not Man his own Justifier,</i>	p. 58, 75, &c.
<i>This Doctrine of Faith's being an Instrument is the Common Doctrine of Protestant Divines,</i>	p. 60.
<i>The</i>	

The Contents.

<i>The Danger of rejecting this notion,</i>	p. 63, 67.
<i>Remarks on Mr. B's. Confession of Faith,</i>	p. 64.
<i>Faith and Works have not the same use in Justification,</i>	p. 66.
<i>The difference between Faith and Works according to Mr. B.</i>	p. 68, 80.
<i>Remarks on Mr. B's. Debate with Mr. Cartwright,</i>	p. 71.
<i>We are justified by Faith alone,</i>	p. 6, 81.
<i>Justification is continued by the same condition that it is begun,</i>	p. 82.
<i>Concerning the Perfection of Justification in this life,</i>	p. 84.
<i>Remarks on Mr. B's. Treatise of Justifying Righteousness,</i>	p. 87.
<i>Mr. B. pleads for Justification by Faith it self, not Relatively and Instrumentally considered,</i>	p. 88.
<i>Gospel-works are not excluded by Mr. B. from Justification,</i>	p. 92, 89.
<i>Remarks on Mr. B's. End of Doctrinal controversies,</i>	p. 90.
<i>Mr. B's. Doctrine has a tendency to establish our own Righteousness in Justification,</i>	p. 91.
<i>Not easy to distinguish Mr. B's. Doctrine of Justification from the Arminian Doctrine,</i>	p. 92.
<i>A brief remark on Mr. B's. Treatise of the Life of Faith,</i>	p. 96.
<i>— On his Paraphrase on the new Testament.</i>	p. ibid.
<i>— On his Scripture Gospel defended,</i>	p. 97.
<i>— On his Catholick Theology,</i>	p. ibid.
<i>The distinction of Faith, considered Absolutely, and Relatively and Instrumentally, explained and confirmed,</i>	p. 98.
<i>Gospel works opposed unto Faith, and excluded in Scripture from Justification,</i>	p. 101.
<i>A brief view of Mr. B's. Doctrine together with the Sum of the usual Protestant Doctrine,</i>	p. 106.

S E C T. V.

<i>Concerning Christ's being a Legal Representative,</i>	p. 107.
<i>This, the Doctrine of our first Reformers, and the Westminster Assembly,</i>	p. 109.
<i>The consideration of Mr. Clifford's General remark,</i>	p. 115.
<i>Mr. B.</i>	

The Contents.

Mr. B. denies Christ to be a proper Representative, either by Vertue of the Covenant of Works, or Grace,	p. 117.
Mr. B. 12 arguments against the proper Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, (which Doctrine is grounded on Christ's being a proper Representative,) considered and answered.	p. 128.
The Assembly's Doctrine of Imputation is absurd and impossible, according to Mr. B. (if his Defendant Mr. Ch. does rightly Represent him,)	p. 130.
Other arguments of Mr. B. and Mr. R. against Christ's being a proper Representative, examined and answered,	p. 139.
Christ Represented us in his Obedience, as well as Suffering,	p. 147.
A specimen of Mr. Robinson's great moderation,	p. 154.
The Doctrine of Christ's personating us in his obedience as well as sufferings, consistent enough with Gospel Conditions,	p. 155.
Christ a Legal Representative only by Vertue of the Covenant of Grace,	p. 157.
Mr. Sa. Clifford's Scurrillous, and groundless Reflections,	p. 107, 161.

S E C T. VI.

The Conclusion,

p. 161.

E R R A T A.

PAGE 13. l. 27. for grounded read ground. l. 34. on. p. 15. l. 3. oppose. p. 26. l. 1, 2. with this, is. p. 38. l. 30. creates us. p. 45. l. 31. managed. p. 46. l. 12. truths: fair. l. 25. but by the l. 28. Church's. p. 50. l. 14. Infirmary. p. 52. l. 29. death. p. 59. l. 30. come. p. 93. l. 28. Jesum. p. 119. l. 16. four dispositions. p. 120. l. 4. may be said to suffer in. p. 125. l. 19. four. p. 128. l. 31. or. p. 137. l. 31. by. p. 139. l. 5. this. p. 159. l. 34. abuse.

